



THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

## **PROTECTION OF AUTHOR'S COPYRIGHT**

This copy has been supplied by the Library of the University of Otago on the understanding that the following conditions will be observed:

1. To comply with s56 of the Copyright Act 1994 [NZ], this thesis copy must only be used for the purposes of research or private study.
2. The author's permission must be obtained before any material in the thesis is reproduced, unless such reproduction falls within the fair dealing guidelines of the Copyright Act 1994. Due acknowledgement must be made to the author in any citation.
3. No further copies may be made without the permission of the Librarian of the University of Otago.

# Translation Technique and the Moral Theme:

Gregory I's *Libellus Responsionum* in Book III of the Old English *Bede*

Lynda E. Lamb

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
at the University of Otago, Dunedin,  
New Zealand

October 31, 2008

## Abstract

This thesis focusses upon a sample section of the Old English *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, Gregory's *Libellus Responsionum*, in order to examine the technique of Bede's Old English translator and to argue that the translator's changes may evidence his desire to communicate the need for moral and penitential vigilance to his audience. Although a translator is always an agent in transferring a text from one culture and language into another, he (or she) may also be an author with ideas, preferences, and objectives of his/her own. To access such an authorial presence in the OE *Bede*, I first isolate "doubling" as part of the rhetorical fabric of the OE *Libellus*. Through particular "doublings," the translator develops a series of repetitions to revise and augment the moralising force of the text. These recurrent, subtle emendations reveal a concern with moral behaviour and penance in the translator's work on the *Libellus*, suggesting that such concerns had particular importance for his version of the text and its inclusion in the Old English *HE*. I then consider the translator's placement of the *Libellus* after Book III of the *HE*, which allows the penitential undertone revealed in his doublings within the *Libellus* to interact with material of penitential value in the later three books of the text. The relationship between the content of the *Libellus* and events contemporary with or prior to the translator's lifetime, reflected in moralistic narrative within the *HE*, can then be seen to extend the impact of this rhetoric into the social and political climate of the translator's audience. Such interactions transform the *Libellus* into a component of the moralising rhetoric of the translator's new, updated *HE*.

## Preface

At the beginning of the first lecture in medieval literature I attended, Dr. Ian Jamieson, fondly dubbed 'Dr. J' by his alumni, began his lecture series by attesting that through every piece of literature we may catch a glimpse of its author. The many 'glimpses' I caught over the course of that semester established the location of my fascination with medieval literature; not necessarily the imagery, characters, places, or events depicted in such literature, but what these things and others allow us to see of the person who set them down, and the world (s)he set them down for. Such intrigue fashioned the centre of the current investigation, effectively a case study in authorial method and voice.

Thanks to Dr. J for first uncovering the glories of medieval literature way back then, to Dr. Greg Waite for teaching me Old English and for his patience and input in nursing me through yet another project, to my friends for forgiving my foibles, and to Simon, for looking after the home front.



# Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Preface	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Abbreviations	vii
A Note on Translations	viii
Chapter 1—Introduction	1
Bede and his History	3
Bede's <i>HE</i> in the "later generation" of Alfred	15
Translation in theory	23
Translation in Alfred's England	29
Bede's Translator and his Work	32
The <i>Libellus Responsionum</i> as a Case Study in Translational Method	35
Chapter 2—Rinse and Repeat: <i>Consideratio</i> and the Path to Clean Living	
in the Doublings of the OE <i>Libellus</i>	45
'Doubling' in the OE <i>Libellus</i> and <i>HE</i>	46
Moralism in the Doublings of the OE <i>Libellus</i>	51
Learning and Knowledge	51
Lifestyle and Personal Conduct	55
Gregory's <i>Consideratio</i> : Thought and Judgement	67
Cleanliness and Purity	84
Penance and Discipline	89
Chapter 3—"For þinre ðearfe:" The <i>Libellus</i> within the <i>HE</i> as a	
Functional Text	104
The 'Clean Lifestyle' of the <i>Libellus</i> within Books III-V of the <i>HE</i>	118

Cleansing and Sacred Spaces	118
Behavioural Purity	129
Cleanliness in Mind, Body, and Deed	140
The <i>Libellus</i> and Moral Structure in the OE and Latin <i>HE</i> texts	144
<b>Chapter 4—<i>Interrogation</i> 5: A Case Study in Style, Placement, and Contexts</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>189</b>
Appendix A: List of doublings found translating single words in the OE <i>Libellus</i>	189
Appendix B: Latin/OE Concordances of ‘Doubled’ Latin Vocabulary Examined in Chapter 2	192
Appendix C: Passages of more than five words excised from the <i>Libellus</i> for the OE version	213
Appendix D: Comparative structure maps of the Latin and OE <i>Bede</i> texts	216

## List of Tables

TABLE 1: Translated occurrences of <i>agere</i> (infinitive form)	69
TABLE 2: Distribution of amended vocabulary sample	117
TABLE 3: Mechanical structure of the Latin and OE versions of Bede's HE:	
Weight distribution by Book	145
TABLE 4: Latin HE moral structure map	147
TABLE 5: Old English HE moral structure map	149

## List of Abbreviations

<i>BOH</i>	Plummer, C. <i>Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.
<i>CED</i>	Haddan, A. W. & W. Stubbs, eds. <i>Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland</i> 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1871.
<i>CM</i>	Colgrave, Bertram & R. A. B. Mynors, eds. <i>Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
<i>CS</i>	Whitelock, D. et al. eds, <i>Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church 1: A.D. 871-1204</i> Part 1: 871-1066. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
<i>EETS</i>	Early English Text Society
<i>EHD</i>	Whitelock, D. <i>English Historical Documents I: c. 500-1042</i> . London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955.
<i>HE</i>	Bede. <i>Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum</i>
<i>MGH</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica (digital)</i> <a href="http://www.dmgh.de/">http://www.dmgh.de/</a>
<i>OE</i>	Old English
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>

## **A Note on Translations**

Unless accompanying citation suggests otherwise, all translations are my own.

## Chapter 1—Introduction

A translator, such as that of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (*HE*) into Old English, presents two identities to consider: that of a translator transferring a text from one language and cultural environment into another; and that of an author with ideas, preferences, and objectives of his own. To access these identities and examine how they interact to produce the finished Old English *HE* within the size constraints of this study, I have selected one of the most dramatic (and contested) alterations the translator made during his translation of Bede's text: the retention of Gregory the Great's *Libellus Responsionum*, and its removal from amidst narrative of Augustine's mission to England in Book I, to a new position at the end of Book III. This thesis will extend the theory of deliberate placement put forward in Sharon Rowley's "Shifting Contexts: Reading Gregory the Great's *Libellus Responsionum* in Book III of the Old English Bede." It will examine the *Libellus*, as a sample section of the OE *Bede*, to demonstrate how the translator has made changes to Bede's text in order to privilege a moral agenda.

As a sample of his style and translation methodology, the *Libellus* provides an opening into the ways in which amendments made to the text internally as part of that style and methodology, alongside the structural alteration effected by its repositioning, impose the translator's own agendas on the *Libellus* and its surrounding text, Bede's *HE*. The *Libellus* is essentially a question/answer dialogue, in epistolary form, between Pope Gregory I and the leader of his mission to England, Augustine. The document addresses many issues which confronted Augustine during the establishment of the Church in England, from living arrangements for the clergy to sexuality. As a work prescribing and critiquing particular behaviours in Christian context, the *Libellus* cannot avoid classification as moralistic, and in light of this general tendency it is frequently found among penitential material in MS contexts outside the *HE* tradition. The text stands out in the OE translation as the only large document the translator chose to retain, and

also as the only section of the text to be removed from its position in the original and placed elsewhere in the work. Despite this unique treatment, however, the OE version of the *Libellus* exhibits the same general style as the rest of the translation, and exemplifies key trends in translation methodology demonstrated throughout the work. As such, the *Libellus* is an ideal document through which to examine the translator's moral intentions.

The OE translation of Bede's *HE* is characterised by the many various changes the translator makes to Bede's work during the transmission process. Deletion of large parts of Bede's text is perhaps the most prominent of these. In particular, the translator removes almost all of the quoted documents Bede included in his work. Letters are the most stringently excluded—the *Libellus* is the only one of these allowed to remain intact. Whole chapters, particularly chapters containing letters, are frequently left out of the translation. More subtle alterations include excisions of paragraphs or sections of chapters, rephrasing of paragraphs to clarify or redirect, and alterations to vocabulary such as the use of tautological pairs of words to express one word in the original. Otherwise known as 'doubling', this feature is a characteristic element of the general style of the OE translation, and will be of particular importance to this exploration of the translator's treatment of the *Libellus* (and its importance to the realisation of his goals for the work as a whole) in chapter 2. This small characteristic alteration frequently demonstrates the translator's tendency to alter his text to privilege concepts and episodes related to the journey of his Christian audience towards salvation, via the living of an ideal Christian life—a life which is described and promoted throughout the *Libellus* in both its original and its translated forms.

The *Libellus* is not just the only letter the translator retains in full, but is also the only part of the text which is found in a different position in the structure of the work in the translated version, having been moved from Book I to the end of Book III. This redistribution interacts with other changes the translator makes to

the *Libellus* during the creation of his version of the *HE*, including the doublings examined in chapter 2, to strengthen and subtly promote the moralising power of the *Libellus* text. As chapter 3 will consider, these alterations also co-operate with the context created by the *Libellus*' new position in the *HE*, to promote the moralism of the translator's *HE* as a whole and to demonstrate the function of the *Libellus* as part of a larger work.

Although a translator may have many coexisting motivations, moralistic or otherwise, for transferring his source text from its original language into another and making changes to that source text, one agenda must underlie all translations: to make the contents of a text written in one language accessible to a new audience of speakers and readers of another language. Chapter 4 will consider this 'new audience' in terms of its possible relationship with the translator's moral agenda, through the *Libellus* and its status within the *HE*. The OE translator's audience is separated from Bede's by both language and time, and must approach the *HE* text from a significantly different social and historical perspective. To cater to his audience effectively, the translator must appeal to this new perspective through his treatment of Bede's text.

### ***Bede and his History***

Although a translation may supplant its source to fulfil a new agenda, it must nevertheless remain a recension of a work authored by another, continually interacting and competing with that source text. As such, the OE translator's identity as distinct from that of Bede, particularly in consideration of the translator's anonymity, can only be established by contrast with the style, preferences, motivations, and experiences of Bede himself. Bede's life has been the subject of



extensive academic study.<sup>1</sup> Details of this life are scarce, besides those afforded by the short autobiography and list of works Bede gives at the end of his *HE* (CM 566-71). This short passage tells us that he was born within the territory of the monastery at Wearmouth and Jarrow, and given into the care of Abbot Benedict, and then Ceolfrið, from the age of seven “to be educated”. From this time onwards, aside from a few possible short expeditions, his life was spent in the monastery, where his career progressed quite rapidly towards ordination as priest at the early age of thirty (CM 566-7). This limited autobiography is immediately followed by a list of some twenty-eight literary, epistolic and teaching texts. Bede’s *HE* was completed in his fifty-ninth year, the last historical entry in Book V being for the year 731.

A letter written on Bede’s death by his pupil, Cuthbert (who later became abbot), reveals that his final days were spent dictating the closing of a literary work (*Epistola de Obitu Bedæ*: CM 580-87). Cuthbert also informs us that Bede was ‘familiar with English poetry’, and, as his life drew to a close, he was working on a translation of the gospel of St. John, and “a selection from Bishop Isidore’s book *On the Wonders of Nature*.” He divided the time in his final days (according to Cuthbert’s letter) chiefly between prayer, religious devotions, and tutelage. His worldly possessions at the time of his death, on the evening of Ascension Day 735,<sup>2</sup> included pepper, napkins, and incense, which he left to be shared among the brothers.

Although this limited cache of biographical and autobiographical material can provide only an indistinct image of Bede, it is supplemented by the wealth of indications of personality and beliefs to be found in his many literary works. Rev.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some key studies of Bede’s life and works include those of Walter Goffart (*The Narrators of Barbarian History*), Robert W. Hanning (*The Vision of History in Early Britain*), Benedicta Ward (*The Venerable Bede*), George Hardin Brown (*Bede the Venerable*), and N. J. Higham (*Re-Reading Bede: The Ecclesiastical History in Context*), essay collections such as *Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings* (edited by A. Hamilton Thompson), and general historiographical works such as Peter Hunter Blair’s *The World of Bede*.

<sup>2</sup> Ascension Day fell on Thursday, May 26th in 735

William Stubbs, in his 1877 entry for Smith and Wace's *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, wrote of Bede that "there is scarcely one of the fathers of whose personal history is so little known, and whose personal character comes out in his writings so clearly" (Scragg 302). These writings, listed at the end of the *HE*, divide into four primary categories: educational treatises; exegetical works; homilies, hagiography, poems, and letters; and histories. He is most famous for the last, but during his lifetime his writings in other areas of expertise earned Bede wide renown before work on the *HE* had even begun. These pre-*Historia* writings include text-book style works suggesting interests in metrics, tropes, orthographics and etymology, the natural world order, and chronology and time (Brown 31-40).

Bede's earlier works show an interest in patterning and order, which is reflected in the narrative structure, careful dating, and attention to source documentation of his *HE*. His hagiography also shows a preference for order and methodic interpretation, systematically incorporating the literary conventions associated with the genre (Brown 65). He also composed exegetical works and commentaries on both favourite and less-studied books of the Bible, which show close adherence to the hermeneutic practices of Augustine, Gregory, and other Church Fathers. These texts reveal a significant knowledge base gleaned from extensive reading of earlier hermeneutics, through which he formed his own methods (Brown 44-45). The methods demonstrated in these exegetical texts are also reflected in his homilies, which show his preaching style to be similar in exegetical approach (Brown 62-3).

Despite their ordered methodology, Bede's works, particularly his poetry, also show considerable artistry. Although the two poetic texts Bede includes in his list of works are now lost, fragments and individual poems survive. His hymn in honour of St. Æðelþryð, included in the *HE* (CM 396-401), seems to combine many of the preoccupations reflected in his other works:

From ... the beginning lines, which bravely restate the topos of the “contrast between pagan and Christian poetry”, it is evident that the poem is something of a tour de force; it is not only alphabetic (twenty-three distichs each beginning with another letter, plus four for AMEN) but also epanaleptic (that is, the last quarter of the distich repeats the first; termed in the Middle Ages reciprocal, echoic, or serpentine). (Brown 74)

The complicated construction of the poem demonstrates Bede’s interests in orthography, metrics, grammar, and linguistics, while the first few lines suggest a recognised tension between oral and written literary forms.

Bede’s letters provide a more personal reflection of his tastes and interests. Although the ‘book of letters’ he includes in his list does not survive as such, we have each of the five letters mentioned, along with two written after the completion of the *HE*. Three of these letters—one to Plegwin, monk of Hexham, refuting charges of heresy concerning Bede’s calculation of the time of Christ’s birth and two answering the computation questions of colleagues—consider issues of chronology. Two answer the exegetical questions of Bishop Acca, Bede’s patron, reflecting the high level of respect his expertise and scholarship afforded from his contemporaries. An appreciative letter to Albinus was attached to the *HE*, and finally, a letter of 734 to the Archbishop of York, Ecgberht, reveals a passionately reformist side to Bede’s nature.

The *HE* was Bede’s last large scale work. The material amassed for this specifically English ‘history’ is organised into five books, each encompassing a stage of the development of Christianity in England.<sup>3</sup> Book I begins by situating Britain

---

<sup>3</sup>Several detailed commentaries on the content of these books, their structure, and the progress of the narrative that they contain exist already. Walter Goffart proposed a factional agenda replying to Stephen of Ripon’s *Life of Wilfrid*, for example, in his *The Narrators of Barbarian History* (1988). Benedicta Ward’s interpretative summary of the content of the five books of the *HE* proposes a structure based on the six ages of the world, with each developmental stage representing one ‘age’ (Ward 114–129). George Hardin Brown has also composed a relatively brief, yet straightforward and comprehensive summary of Bede’s five books in *Bede the Venerable* (1987). More recently, N. J. Higham has examined the structure and content of the *HE* in depth in *(Re-)reading Bede: The Ecclesiastical History in Context* (2006).

geographically and describing its various peoples and languages. This book then covers the history of pre-Anglo-Saxon England, before relating the coming of Christianity through the mission of St. Augustine, initiated by Pope Gregory I. Its closing relates the life of king Æðelfrið, whose success in conquering and settling more land for the English race than any before him (CM 116.11-14) is venerated *excepto dumtaxat hoc, quod divinae erat religionis ignarus*, drawing together the concepts of secular and spiritual conquest to foreshadow the relationship between king and church to be developed throughout the following Books.

Bede opens Book II with a lengthy chapter detailing the life and works of Gregory, venerating his service to the English and Christianity in general. The mission introduced by Gregory's deployment of Augustine and his companions to England then begins in earnest. Much of Book II is dominated by conversion narratives, particularly that of King Edwin. The career of this king influences the content of the book from chapter IX to the final chapter, XX. This chapter relates the death of Edwin, but closes the book positively with a description of the appointment of Paulinus as Bishop of Rochester, and of the virtues of James, left at York in Paulinus' place, thus repeating the association between secular and ecclesiastic governance established at the close of Book I.

Where Book II privileges the career of King Edwin, exemplifying the ideal conversion process through his narrative, Book III venerates another king: Oswald. With the conversion process well underway, this book "treats mainly the subsequent development of the Church in Northumbria" (Brown 92), and has an ideal Christian king—a "central model of insular kingship"—at the centre of its discourse (Higham 144). Christianity in England is still characterised by instability, however. The opening of the book details apostasy as Osric and Eanfrið, successors of the previously venerated Edwin and Æðelfrið respectively, "abjured and betrayed the mysteries of the heavenly kingdom to which they had been admitted and reverted to the filth of their former idolatry, thereby to be polluted and destroyed" (CM 213).

Book III presents a new stage of English Christianity, in which customs at the core of Christian belief, such as the observance of Easter and the correct form of the tonsure, are debated and established and the administrative structure of the Church solidifies. Bede's third book juxtaposes Christian rulers such as Oswald, Oswine, and Oswiu, with pagan ones (such as Penda) and apostates, with whom the book opens and closes, before England's Christianity is finally cemented in Book IV.

Following the final chapter of Book III, in which the apostasy of Sighere and his people is overcome by Bishop Jaruman, the first chapter of Book IV recounts the consolidation of the English Church. Opening with a resolution to the Easter dating issue as Colman returns "to his own people" after the synod of Whitby (CM 329), IV:I details the election of Theodore, who "was the first of the archbishops whom the whole English Church consented to obey" (CM 333), to the archbishopric. Benedicta Ward comments:

Book IV at once presents a new and positive stage in the conversion of the English... The preoccupation of the first missionaries with conversion, baptism, and preaching was over, the Church was established ... (Ward 124-5)

This book correspondingly details the growth of religious culture, depicting the foundation of monasteries and schools alongside synods on religious discipline and teachings. Alongside these depictions of ecclesiastic and monastic cultural growth, Bede continues to illustrate secular governance and to demonstrate the developing relationship between worldly and spiritual leadership. He closes his fourth book with a 'life' of St. Cuthbert, an Irish counterpart to Theodore as representative of the Roman model (Brown 94).

Bede's final book "brings the *History* from the time of Cuthbert's successor (after 677) up to the present (mid-731)" (Brown 94), and draws "together the original themes of the whole work" while also suggesting "the wider horizons that were now open for the English" (Ward 127). In this book, the religious culture developed in Book IV continues to grow, and the horizons of the English Church

expand into other lands. At the close of the book, “the final unity of the Church [was] established” and “the state of England, now united to the Christ of the resurrection, was one, potentially, of peace and love” (Ward 129).

As Brown has noted, the execution of the *HE* combined all the literary skills Bede acquired during his long career, and “his education, training, and talent culminate in that *History*” (81) to produce a work with particular intentions. Bede’s own nomenclature for the work provides some indication of these intentions. His descriptions of the text in its title—*Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*—and the entry he provides in the list of works found at the end of the *HE*—*Historiam ecclesiasticam nostrae insulae ac gentis in libris V* (CM 570.7)<sup>4</sup>—clearly communicate its nature and the material it seeks to disseminate. Bede’s work is an *ecclesiastical* history, and as such tracks the development of a church according to the conventions of that genre:

An ecclesiastical history, based on biblical rather than classical concepts of time and event, presupposes a theocentric universe in which primary concern is focussed on the sacred, and the secular is understood in terms of the sacred; it is a history that traces the development of the church as it advances in time and geography to “the ends of the earth” (Acts 1:8). It describes conversion and the spread of the faith. But because the accomplishment of that development in the sixth age is to be accompanied by apocalyptic evils, such a history is not naively cheery but only guardedly optimistic. (Brown 86)

But unlike historiographical accounts of the universal Christian Church, such as that of Eusebius, which is argued to have had a heavy influence on the *HE*, Bede’s work is limited to the history of the Church *nostrae gentis* (‘of our nation’ CM 2.9)—of England and the English peoples (Brown 86).

In his brief analysis of the *HE* in *Bede the Venerable*, George Hardin Brown asserts that:

---

<sup>4</sup> “The history of the Church of our island and race, in five books.” (CM 571)

... it is ... clear from the architecture and narrative thrust of the *History* that the great aim of the whole work was to expound the development of God's plan for the English as a chosen people and the development of one unified Church in that violent and feuding land. (Brown 89)

Bede's description of the state of his land in the final narrative chapter of the *HE* certainly supports this interpretation, closing a work filled with upheavals with a description of "peace and prosperity" (CM 561):

[1.1] Qua adridente pace ac serenitate temporum, plures in gente Nordanhymbrorum, tam nobiles quam priuati, se suosque liberos depositis armis satagunt magis, accepta tonsura, monasterialibus adscribere uotis quam bellicis exercere studiis. (CM 560.15-18)<sup>5</sup>

From Bede's earlier narrative, however, it becomes apparent that the "peace and prosperity" he mentions comes after periods of fierce territorial conflict and political confusion (Wormald, 73). The realistic extent of Æðelbald or Ceowulf's respective supremacies, described previous to the passage above (CM 558.27-560.2), is debatable; passages preceding these concluding statements describe Ceowulf's rule as turbulent and unstable:

[1.2] ... Osric rex Nordanhymbrorum, uita decessit, cum ipse regni (quod XI annis gubernabat) successorem fore Ceoluulfum decreuisset, fratrem illius qui ante se regnauerat, Coenredi regis, cuius regni et principia et processus tot ac tantis redundauere rerum aduersantium motibus ut, quid de his scribi debeat, quemue habitura sint finem singula, necdum sciri ualeat. (CM 556-9)<sup>6</sup>

Further, Bede was most likely aware of Ceolwulf's brief loss of control of his kingdom and forcible tonsure, recorded in the addendum to the recapitulation in

---

<sup>5</sup> "In these favourable times of peace and prosperity, many of the Northumbrian race, both noble and simple, have laid aside their weapons and taken the tonsure, preferring that they and their children should take monastic vows rather than train themselves in the art of war." (CM 561)

<sup>6</sup> "Osric, king of the Northumbrians, departed this life when he had reigned eleven years, after appointing Ceolwulf, brother of his predecessor Cenred, as his successor. Both the beginning and the course of his reign have been filled with so many and such serious commotions and setbacks that it is as yet impossible to know what to say about them or what the outcome will be." (CM 557-9)

V:XXIV for 731 (CM 572), the very year Bede's *HE* was completed.<sup>7</sup> As Benedicta Ward claimed, Bede's "state of peace and unity was, of course, not factually true, and Bede knew it to be so" (112). Thus, aware of the instability of the political climate at the time, Bede manufactures a 'happy ending' of guarded positivity, to draw the upheavals within the *HE* together with its many God-driven wonders and successes and convince the reader that the coming of God to the English resulted in an age of spiritual plenty, and in peace.

According to J. T. Rosenthal, Bede intended this Christian "era of faith" (15) as a successor to the prosperity of the Roman occupation of Britain, the end of which is described in I:XII. Previous histories, such as that of Gildas, portray post-Roman Britain as being in a state of progressive decline. In opposition to this, Bede's "reason for the composition of the *Ecclesiastical History* was to show that the conventional world view—that we are now in an age of iron after the fall from an age of gold—was erroneous" (Rosenthal 5). The *HE* suggests that post-Roman Britain, although perhaps in a state of material decay, began a new "age of gold" when the Anglo-Saxons accepted Christianity.

This "age of gold", however, is to be perpetuated by current and future Christians, rather than those "men of old" (CM 3) depicted in the *HE*. At the close of the *HE* narrative, Bede places later generations in a position to witness whether the "peace and prosperity" brought by God will continue:

[1.3] Quae res quem sit habitura finem, posterior aetas uidebit. (CM 560.18-19)<sup>8</sup>

Readers are thus reminded of their role in the maintenance and development of such a "golden age"—the behaviour of individuals, such as those afforded episodes

---

<sup>7</sup> Colgrave and Mynors explain this continuation of V:XXIV thus: "After the conclusion of the whole work, the Moore MS. adds the following annals, of which those for 733 and 734 stand in c, as we have seen, in the text of chapter xxiv (above, p. 566)" (CM 572)

<sup>8</sup> "What the result will be, a later generation will discover." (CM 561)



throughout the *HE* itself, determines the longevity of peace and prosperity and the position of England in God's favour.

Bede's prefatorial statement of intent appeals directly to this suggestion that the conduct of individuals, as members of a Christian people, had special importance. Aside from expressions of intent built into his titling and his own description of the *HE*, Bede states a purpose for the *HE* directly in his preface. He cites a desire to present a series of positive and negative exemplary portraits to his audience (CM 3):

[1.4] Siue enim historia de bonis bona referat, ad imitandum bonum auditor sollicitus instigatur; seu mala commemoret de prauis, nihilominus religiosus ac pius auditor siue lector deuotando quod noxium est ac peruersum, ipse sollertius ad exsequenda ea quae bona ac Deo digna esse cognouerit, accenditur. Quod ipsum tu quoque uigilantissime deprehendens, historiam memoratam in notitiam tibi simul et eis, quibus te regendis diuina praefecit auctoritas, ob generalis curam salutis latius propalari desideras. (CM 2.10-18)<sup>9</sup>

Essentially, his motivations are didactic; he intends his work as a tool for the moral and behavioural improvement of its readers. Considered alongside Bede's explicit statements of intent in his preface, and the body of the work itself (an episode in Book V, for example, closes with "The story spread far and wide and roused many people to do penance for their sins without delay. And may the reading of this account of ours have the same effect!" (CM 505)), the frequency with which a reader encounters episodes of moral value when reading the text substantiates Bede's desire to create a didactic, edifying work. He repeatedly directs his readers towards the

---

<sup>9</sup> "Should history tell of good men and their good estate, the thoughtful listener is spurred on to imitate the good; should it record the evil ends of wicked men, no less effectually the devout and earnest listener or reader is kindled to eschew what is harmful and perverse, and himself with greater care pursue those things which he has learned to be good and pleasing in the sight of God. This you perceive, clear-sighted as you are; and therefore, in your zeal for the spiritual well-being of us all, you wish to see my *History* more widely known, for the instruction of yourself and those over whom divine authority has appointed you to rule." (CM 3)

most spiritually correct way of life, against a background to which both secular and ecclesiastic audiences could relate: the history of their own Church and country.

The opening of Bede's preface also suggests the nature of the audience he envisaged for the *HE*, and what use he intended that audience to make of the work. Bede characterises his dedicatee, King Ceolwulf, as responsible for the moral well-being of "those over whom divine authority has appointed" him (CM 3). Through his dedicatee, Bede evokes a Gregorian ideal of leadership, later seen also in works and representations of Alfred. This ideal expects the secular ruler to govern his people both materially and morally or spiritually, entrusting him with a responsibility to instruct and improve the Christian lives of his subjects—to be "not so much kings of men, as shepherds [or pastors] of flocks" (Hipshon 452). By including Ceolwulf among those of an "intellectual and moral elite" of "spiritual pastors", whose role it was "to exhort and instruct the faithful" (Thacker 131), Bede suggests the wider audience he envisaged for the *HE*. The *HE* was intended for the instruction and use of the members of this "intellectual and moral elite", a population Alan Thacker identified in his 1983 study, "Bede's Ideal of Reform:"

In a sermon he [Bede] argued that spiritual pastors ordained to preach the mysteries of the word included not only those in major orders but also the rulers of monasteries and even the heads of secular households, however small. Elsewhere he claimed that in the Scriptures the term *sacerdos* was mystically to be understood as comprehending not only the ministers of the altar but all who excelled in right living and healthful doctrine. (Thacker 131)

Bede intended the moral examples he refers to in his preface for the use and instruction of any member of society who was placed in a position of responsibility over others. Through his work, Bede intended to provide exempla to improve the moral quality of these "spiritual pastors", whether they be heads of Church orders or heads of families, so that they might improve their own lifestyles and better transmit the ways of "right living" to those in their charge.

The morally didactic agenda Bede admits in the preface, however, has not satisfied modern scholars as an expression of his sole motivation for creating such a complex work as the *HE*. Scholars have thus looked past this statement of intent to propose additional or alternative primary objectives. Higham proposes that:

... these stretch from the neo-Plummerian view, at one extreme, of a cloistered author writing a primarily meditative work, fired by idealism and with very little contact with the world of contemporary politics, through the *Ecclesiastical History* as a specimen of reformist literature, written by an enthusiast for moral renewal in the present, to a vision of a more politically engaged author, writing on behalf of a particular faction within the Northumbrian Church in the contest for the coming archdiocese of York” (Higham 95)

Although many agendas, such as those touched on above and those Higham explores in his investigation of Bede’s purposes, may shift in and out of focus over the progression of the *HE*’s narrative, Bede’s inclusion of a statement of intent in his preface positions this particular agenda as that under which any other must operate. This statement of intent communicates a moralist intention to improve readers through presentation of behavioural examples, and thus aims at moral reform in a similar manner to his final letter, to Egbert.

Although the *HE* closes with a positive description of peace and a growing monastic population, Bede’s letter to Egbert, written in the few years between completion of the *HE* and his death, reveals his dissatisfaction with the behaviour and lifestyles of these new monastics. Bede’s *Epistola ad Ecgberhtum* reveals critical concern with the state of the Church alongside the development of secular society and politics, and essentially contains a program of reform. Scott DeGregorio’s 2002 paper “Nostrorum socordiam temporum” demonstrates a thematic shift towards the need for reform in Bede’s later works. This final letter to Archbishop Egbert, DeGregorio argues, is not the only indication of Bede’s concern with the relationship between secular and religious society (107-8). The concept of ‘reform’ detailed in Bede’s final letter opposes ‘secularisation’ of monastic society. This

secularisation applies to personal behaviours, such as drinking, feasting, and general lax behaviour unobservant of monastic discipline, and to wider issues of social organisation such as the abuse of monastic foundations by laymen wishing to avoid secular demands of military service and taxation. Suggestions of Bede's desire to see these issues rectified are certainly most evident in his final letter, written only months before his death, but his commentaries, homilies, hagiography, and histories are also "permeated with a vision of reform in church and society which was to leave its mark on more than his own generation", reflecting a conscious interaction with social development and conditions outside Wearmouth and Jarrow (Thacker 130). Bede, himself a witness to a "later generation" such as those he foresaw at the close of his *History*, therefore perceived fundamental behavioural errors in the Christian English. These errors were most likely already evident and a concern to him before he began the *HE* and as he was composing it only five years or so before writing his letter to Egberht - indeed, suggestions of such concerns can be found throughout his works from as early as his commentary on I Samuel, in 716 (Thacker 132-133).

### ***Bede's HE in the "later generation" of Alfred***

Bede's combination of agendas for the *HE* is reflected in the literature of another "later generation"—that of Alfred the Great—which was confronted with its own social and political difficulties. Although the OE *Bede's* inclusion among the canon of Alfred's own translations is now generally discredited "on grounds of dialect and style" (Pratt 116), surviving MS copies of the translation date to suggest it was conceived within the same period as Alfred's works and educational program.<sup>10</sup> Many of the issues which confronted Alfred and the scholars associated with his literary circle, both in terms of social and political pressures and in terms of literary

---

<sup>10</sup> The earliest extant example of the OE *Bede*—London, British Library, Cotton MS. Domitian ix, f. 11 (MS Z)—has been dated to the opening of the tenth century. This fragment contains three extracts of Bede's *History*, from Book IV:V, I:XXVII, and II:III; the first of which is probably a continuation from a preceeding leaf (Ker 151).

theory and methodologies, may thus have influenced the translator of Bede's *HE* as he assembled his Old English version of the work.

When Alfred acceded to the throne in 871, he did so as sole ruler of a large West Saxon kingdom continually threatened by attacks from encroaching Viking colonists. Between 865 and 878, when Alfred concluded a pact with the Viking king Guthrum, all the English kingdoms outside Alfred's borders came under Viking control, either conquered or ruled by 'puppets' under Viking influence (Frantzen 5). Only Wessex retained its ruling dynasty, as such becoming a unique preserve of English national identity. During the peaceful period between Alfred's agreement with Guthrum (and subsequent repulsion of the Viking forces in 880) and the return of the invaders in 892, Alfred instituted a programme of educational reform and composed his translations. According to David Pratt, this educational programme effectively "amounted to a reorientation of aristocratic education, towards a model placing special weight on the reading of vernacular texts, particularly in the form of prose" (115). Many of the vernacular Anglo-Saxon manuscripts surviving come to us from the period of Alfred's reign, and there is little material evidence of written English from before this time (Stanton 46). Alfred's royal initiation, promotion, and performance of translation into English provides a probable catalyst for the flourishing of English literature in the ninth century—indeed, Pratt argues that "royal' texts dominate surviving ninth-century vernacular prose" (116).

Alfred laid out his plans and motivations for translation into English most clearly in a letter attached to the copy of his own translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis* preserved in MS Hatton 20, which was addressed to Bishop Wærferð and intended for the use of the English Bishops. Malcolm Godden has explored this prefatory letter and other literary evidence for the origins of Alfred's educational programme. In his 2002 paper "King Alfred's Preface and the Teaching of Latin in Anglo-Saxon England", Godden argues that Alfred's aims in instituting an

educational programme did not centre on literacy in Latin, but on English reading and writing:

His primary concern was with fostering literacy in the vernacular and adding to the body of texts available in English, for both the laity and the clergy; Latin could be left to be taught where and when there were appropriate teachers and appropriate students. (Godden 604)

This argument is based on a re-reading of a critical sentence in Alfred's letter referring to the teaching of Latin literacy:

[1.5] lære mōn siððan furður ón Lædengeðiode ða ðe mōn furðor læran wille & to hieran hade dón wille. (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 7.13-15)<sup>11</sup>

In his 1871 edition of the text, Sweet translates *to hieran hade* as "to a higher rank" (*Cura Pastoralis* 7). Godden agrees with Sweet's interpretation of the target for this teaching of Latin, refuting interpretations following Whitelock's 1955 translation "bring to holy orders" (*EHD* 819). Key to the verification of Godden's interpretation is the existence of the *Cura Pastoralis* translation itself, which was performed and intended for the use of Bishops, implying that those of high rank in the holy orders were assumed not to have a good knowledge of Latin either (602).

Alfred's brief instruction follows a long lament over the state of learning in his kingdom, which had significantly decayed both before and during his lifetime. Due to a lack of vernacular literacy, Alfred states, educational standards of excellence had declined along with Latin learning, independent of recent military invasions:

[1.6] Ða ic ða ðis eall gemunde ða gemunde ic eac hu ic geseah, ærðæmðe hit eall forhergod wære & forbærned, hu ða ciricean giond eall Angelcynn stodon maðma & boca gefyldæ ond eac micel menigeo Godes ðiowa & ða swiðe lytle fiorme ðara boca wiston, forðæmðe hie hiora nan wuht óngiotan

---

<sup>11</sup> "and let those be afterwards taught more in the Latin language who are to continue learning and be promoted to a higher rank." (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 7)

ne meahton forðæmðe hie næron ón hiora agen geðiode awritene. (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 5.8-13)<sup>12</sup>

Alfred's focus on knowledge and understanding (*wiston*, *ongiotan*) suggests that he values knowledge of the *content* of the books he refers to, rather than proficiency in the Latin language, and prefers the promotion of the vernacular to provide wider access to the texts. He asks the recipients of the *Pastoral Care* preface to institute an English reading course, supplemented by Latin learning where appropriate. The intended result of the programme the preface outlines "could be presented as a revival, reversing sapiential decline" (Pratt 115).

Although Alfred's stated intentions in the *Cura Pastoralis* preface privilege a motivation common to all translation—to improve accessibility—modern scholarship has looked deeper than this surface agenda. The nationalist drive of Alfredian literature has received particular attention. The translations produced as part of Alfred's literary program aimed to promote English language and culture as well as to facilitate feelings of fellowship, echoing Bede's patriotic theme. Asser, author of Alfred's contemporary 'Life', refers to Alfred founding a school to support his programme, teaching both Latin and English, where "all the young men of the region, including his own son Æðelweard, were educated" (Godden 598). Alice Sheppard has observed that this instruction, through or by Alfred himself, of "all the young men", without rank or race distinction, is portrayed as a deliberate manoeuvre of lordship in Asser's 'life' of Alfred. Sheppard analyses Asser's work to argue that, from a political viewpoint, Alfred's education programme had its focus not only on language, but on instruction as a unifying device (429). Key to this standpoint, Sheppard draws attention to Alfred's own justification for his educational programme, again to be found in his letter to Wærferð:

---

<sup>12</sup> "When I considered all this I remembered also how I saw, before it had all been ravaged and burnt, how the churches throughout the whole of England stood filled with treasures and books, and there was also a great multitude of God's servants, but they had very little knowledge of the books, for they could not understand anything of them, because they were not written in their own language." (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 4)

[1.7] Ælfrēd kyning hateð gretan Wærferð biscep his wordum luflice & freondlice; & ðe cyðan hate ðæt me com swiðe oft ón gemynd, hwelce wiotan iu wæron giond Angelcynn, ægðer ge godcundra hada ge woruldcundra; & hu gesæliglica tida ða wæron giond Angelcynn; & hu ða kyningas ðe ðone ónwald hæfdon ðæs folces on ðam dagum Gode & his ærendwrecum hersumedon; & hie ægðer ge hiora sibbe ge hiora siodo ge hiora ónweald innanbordes gehioldon, & eac út hiora eðel gerymdon; & hu him ða speow ægðer ge mid wige ge mid wisdom (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 3.1-9)<sup>13</sup>

This passage forms the opening to Alfred's letter, and immediately draws a direct correlation between the state of learning in a kingdom and political stability within its borders. Alfred claims that while there were learned men throughout England, the peace, customs, and authority of the country's kings were preserved. He aims to recreate this stability, at least in part, through regeneration of learning in his kingdom. This decision to focus on the vernacular in his educational programme suggests that Alfred's rejuvenation of scholarship in his kingdom used not only the familial bond created through shared learning from a teacher, as Asser suggests, but also capitalised on the unifying power of a native language in the context of a cultural threat.

If education creates fellowship and peace through the shared learning experience, it is not difficult to perceive the way in which moral reform, which effectively enacts standardisation of behaviour, could be harnessed to promote unity as well. In the passage above, Alfred cites "peace, morality, and order at home" as a complex ideal of "wisdom", placed alongside military success or "war", and thus associates moral standards with social order directly. In her 2005 thesis examining

---

<sup>13</sup> "King Alfred bids greet Bishop Wærferth with his words lovingly and with friendship; and I let it be known to thee that it has very often come into my mind, what wise men there formerly were throughout England, both of sacred and secular orders; and how happy times there were then throughout England; and how the kings who had power over the nation in those days obeyed God and his ministers; and they preserved peace, morality, and order at home, and at the same time enlarged their territory abroad; and how they prospered both with war and with wisdom ... (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 2-3)



marital morality in late (post-Alfredian) Anglo-Saxon literature, Melanie Hayworth recognises that “moral regulation, in its promotion of conformity to its prescriptions and proscriptions, provides a tangible sense of belonging which cannot be discounted as an incentive, consciously recognised or not, to adherence to regulation” (5). As the preface cited above suggests, moral standards formed an important part of Alfred’s understanding of peace and prosperity in his kingdom, and may have been used as a tool for unification in a similar manner to his use of shared education.

Although Alfred’s impulse towards moral correction in his kingdom is acknowledged in many studies of his life, works, and works associated with his promotion of educational reform, perhaps the most compelling indications of his desire to restore and regulate morality are contained in his prefaces. Alfred’s movement to re-educate his people had several apparent motivations, expressed through prefaces to the translations into Old English which formed part of his programme and through internal changes to these works themselves. As Allen Frantzen has underscored, prefaces enable a translator to direct the reader’s perception of the translated work they are about to absorb—a preface “explains the text but also calls attention to the need for an explanation” (Frantzen 123). Alfred’s “explanation” prefacing the *Pastoral Care* describes morality as an element of wisdom, as touched on above, but also associates this wisdom, and the spread of wisdom, directly with the favour of God and the well-being of the kingdom:

[1.8] Geðenc hwelc witu ús ða becomon for ðisse worulde, ða ða we hit  
nohwæðer ne selfe ne lufodon ne eac oðrum monnum ne lefdon: ðone  
naman anne we lufodon ðætte we Cristne wæren, & swiðe feawe ða ðeawas.  
(Sweet *Pastoral Care* 55-8)<sup>14</sup>

Lack of love for wisdom and failure to disseminate it are described as evidence of a poor attitude—one in which the name of Christian is claimed, but the *ðeawas*

---

<sup>14</sup> Consider what punishments came upon us because of this world, when we neither loved (wisdom) for itself nor allowed it to other men: then we held the name alone that we were Christian, and (held) very few of the virtues.

(habits or customs) of that estate are not properly observed. This passage of the preface aligns a failure to spread wisdom, and thus to promote and regulate morality, with worldly punishments. Part of Alfred's agenda as it is expressed in this preface, therefore, is to institute a return to practices which will encourage restoration of these Christian *ðéawas* and circumvent further heavenly discipline.

The importance of morality as a target for reform in Alfred's kingdom and as part of his literary programme is also evident in the nature of the works which were selected for translation. Each of the major works included in the restricted Alfredian "literary canon" identified by Janet Bately ("The Alfredian Canon" 109)—*Hierdeboc* (*Cura Pastoralis*) particularly, but also *Boethius*, and *Soliloquies*—is a text which addresses the concepts of thought and behaviour in the context of achieving a dignified, Christian life (or death). Of the range of Latin literature available for translation during the Alfredian period, these books were, according to J. M. Wallace Hadrill, "obvious books for ... self-instruction and general instruction in the social role of Christianity" (*Early Germanic Kingship* 142).

David Pratt and others have suggested that the influence of Gregorian thought extended beyond the three major translations identified as forming the core of Alfred's canon above, identifying Asser's *Life of Alfred* and Wærferth's *Dialogues* as particular demonstrators of veneration of Gregorian ideas during the Alfredian period (Pratt 134–151). The privileging of Gregorian ideas evident in the work of Alfred, Asser, and Wærferth may inform our understanding of the decisions of Bede's OE translator regarding Gregory's presence in his version of the *HE*. Discenza argues that Alfred's translations are bound together by a "unified vision" which "synthesise[s] models of society from Christian Latin literature with Anglo-Saxon ideals and reality" ("Influence of Gregory" 67). This "unified vision" of society "drew heavily on the work of Gregory" (67), and, according to Pratt, Gregorian ideas had a "deep impact ... on Alfredian thinking and behaviour" (136). Since, as Pratt points out, "there can be no question of the translation programme

being confined to the king's immediate circle" (120), the OE *Bede* could have been influenced by the reforming impulse evident in the prefaces and works associated with that movement.

Along with such thematic elements, the OE *Bede* shares particular lexical and stylistic features with one of the works associated with the Alfredian translation movement in particular—Bishop Wærferð's translation of St. Gregory's *Dialogues*. These texts are similar in their vocabulary and approach to sources, both frequently exhibiting a narrow translatory method, and often resorting to gloss-like 'word for word' transference (Potter 2). In adherence to this trend towards close rendering, neither text shows any tendency towards introducing new ideas to the text (Potter 5). Nevertheless, both translators frequently expand on existing ideas, through insertion of explanations and clarification, or succinct commentary on personal names or names of places (Potter 6). Examining the style of the *HE* translation, Whitelock also notes mutual features with the translation of Wærferð, such as a certain amount of shared diction including 'fixed renderings' of Latin words, a tendency towards 'doubling', and over-literal translation suggestive of the influence of interlinear glossing ("Old English Bede" 76).

The Old English *HE* translation, however, is often not consistent with these general conclusions. The stiff 'over-literality' that Sweet noted in his *Anglo-Saxon Reader* (1876: 195) is 'offset' with fluent inter-lingual transmissions, frequently altering the aesthetic and readability of the text. Poetic flavour, stylistic principles of addition and excision, and interchange between literal, imitative, and free translation throughout the work lead Whitelock to state that:

it seems to me that the facts are not incompatible with a view of a single author, perhaps working in haste, unable to shed the habits of a school of interlinear glossing, who nevertheless was capable of vivid writing when his interest was stirred ("Old English Bede" 76-7)

In his approach to excision from his source, the Bede translator is far more liberal than Wærferð is in his *Dialogues* (Potter 7-9). Nevertheless, the *HE* translation's

stylistic character appears to share enough features with Wærferð's work to suggest that the 'school' of scholarship hinted at in Whitelock's comment above influenced both writers.

As could be expected of a translation conceived in such an environment as that which produced Wærferð's *Dialogues* and the other translations associated with Alfred, the OE *Bede* shares a sense of patriotism with Alfred's intentions, but also demonstrates particular moralising tendencies through changes made to the text. St. Jacques notes:

Bede organises much of his material in such a way that his reader perceives the past as a series of patterns; his Old English translator, on the other hand, seems to see in the Latin a loose assembling of noteworthy and dramatic events more in the tradition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle but with a strong moralistic bent. (St. Jacques 85)

This study of the OE *Bede* examines the extent to which changes made to Gregory's *Libellus*, including its redistribution, constitute a manifestation of this "moralistic bent" and contribute to the moralising impact of the translated text.

### *Translation in theory*

Before moving on to introduce the translator and translation of Bede's *HE* in more depth, it seems pertinent to consider the theory of translation. Although the translator shares English origins with Bede, he lived and worked in an Anglo-Saxon culture with many generations of additional heritage. If the composition of the Old English *HE* is placed within the reign of Alfred, as MS dating and the general scholarly consensus suggest (although whether the work can be directly associated with Alfred's educational reforms is contested), the OE translation post-dates Bede's work by up to one hundred and seventy years. During this intervening period, Anglo-Saxon England continued its political and cultural development. Bede's own text, from which much of modern scholarship's information on England at that time is taken, tells us that politically and ecclesiastically his England was still fragmentary. At the close of Bede's text, the environment of England (or at least Northumbria) is

beginning to encourage monastic growth (see extract 1.1). The later generations he envisaged (*Quae res quem sit habitura finem, posterior aetas uidebit* CM 560.18-19), however, were confronted with a very different social reality. The rapid rate of cultural and economic change often remarked on by scholars of the Anglo-Saxon period separates the two authors and their chosen languages into very different worlds, with diverse systems of cultural valuation.

All translation contains something of the culture and environment of the translator. Critically, these factors are primarily facilitated by the translator's position in time, each developing alongside the other as time passes. Motivations and traditions Bede utilised for his text may have had little (or changed) relevance for the translator, due to cultural space between the translator's England and Bede's. No two societies, whether differentiated temporally, physically, or otherwise, are exactly equal in culture, perspective, framework, and manners of expression. The translator's text of the *HE*, as a negotiation of the space between the translator's society and Bede's, is affected by the same pressures as any other translation. Foremost among these pressures are the requirements of the new audience for a version of the original text that is relevant to their understanding. This understanding is determined by the historical context—including political and cultural climate, linguistic, literary and colloquial conventions—of the translator's intended audience. As such, the Anglo-Saxon translation of Bede's *HE* presents the reader with a text rather different from its original, in content as well as in language.

Translations from one language into another involve both linguistic and cultural exchanges. Each exchange occurs between disparate mediums; just as each society and cultural identity is distinct, so each language is linguistically and semiotically unique. Converting information from one language medium into another is thus always a process of manipulation and transference between unequal mediums, into a metaphoric representation. This process of interpretation,

dissection and reconstruction is incapable of yielding an exact reproduction of context, expression, imagery, or even motivation (Rabassa 1).

Translation theorist Susan Bassnett-McGuire has remarked that “language ... is the heart within the body of culture”, providing an engine not only for the expression of culture, but also for its discourse, development, and memory (Bassnett-McGuire 14). Translating from one language to another is thus not a purely linguistic activity, but involves cultural translation. Cultural values of the translating or ‘target’ culture are imposed on the source text, through a process of “decoding and recoding”, to enable the new audience’s comprehension (Bassnett-McGuire 16). A natural companion to cultural difference, linguistic and phonetic disparity adds another layer to an already complex process of alteration (Rabassa 2-3). The semantics of each unique language are drawn from its mutually sustaining culture, and expressed through the unique (or borrowed) sounds and words of that language.

Translation essentially involves “semiotic reformation” of a source into a version with some level of equivalence to that source (Bassnett-McGuire 24). Bassnett-McGuire draws on Anton Popovič’s 1976 *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* to outline four types of translational equivalence: linguistic, paradigmatic, stylistic, and textual (Bassnett-McGuire 25). Linguistic equivalence requires the source and target texts to align on a linguistic level, or ‘word for word’. Grammatical or “paradigmatic” equivalence involves reproduction of elements of grammar, while translation reproducing the expressed meaning or ‘sense’ of the source text demonstrates “stylistic equivalence”.

Drawing on Cicero and Horace in Epistle 57, Jerome advocates the acceptance of necessary linguistic difference between source and target languages to serve and preserve the source text (Copeland 45). Jerome recognises the error of too literal translation, which often results in an impenetrable text that only poorly transmits the true sense of the original to the receiving culture (Bassnett-McGuire

21-3). In his preface to the collaborative 1680 translation of Ovid's *Epistles*, Dryden also warns against reliance on "metaphrase" (translation demonstrating 'linguistic equivalence', transforming the text into the target language "word for word, and line by line") when translating Latin (Schulte 17). He bases his caution around the risk that important elements of sense may be lost due to linguistic and cultural differences between target and source, echoing Jerome's recommendations for translation into Latin over a thousand years earlier.

Stylistic equivalence, or "paraphrase" (Schulte 17), involves dissection and reconstruction of the source content into a re-expression, through which the target culture is able to comprehend the same meaning as the source expresses. Jerome promotes this approach to translation, advising translation "not word by word, but sense from sense" (Davis, "Performance of Translation" 161). Translation 'sense for sense' (or 'paraphrase') is "translation with latitude", transforming the source text with closer adherence to sense than words. The translator keeps the author "in view" at all times, but translates the sense of the text so that the new audience receives the same message as the original audience (Schulte 17).

Where the target text replicates the "form and shape" of its source, it demonstrates "textual equivalence", or "imitation". According to Dryden, "imitation" takes "only some general hints from the original", bypassing both the words and sense of the source as occasion demands to form an original work in its image (Schulte 17). This translation style is perhaps especially evident in the work of later medieval authors, such as Chaucer, who presents a series of imitations of various literary genres and particular texts in his *Canterbury Tales*. Earlier, Anglo-Saxon literature frequently venerates Latin source texts through imitation:

The Anglo-Saxon world was shaped to literary use by men who wrote and spoke Latin, and thought it an ideal language ... and a large part of the literature is translated or imitated from Latin authors (Owen 59).

In many early Latin to English translations, an anxiety to assure the validity or authority of the translated text, and to legitimate the vernacular as a medium for

religious scholarship and expression, manifests itself in replication of Latin syntax in the vernacular text. 'Imitating' the Latin constructions of the original composition, the new text creates an (often illusionary) impression of faithful, word for word correspondence with the source (Discenza 72-3).

As the prefaces to Alfred's translations would suggest, Anglo-Saxon translations generally, and specifically in the case of the Old English *HE*, tend to employ all the above types of translation as occasion demands. Such deviations from the source text as are found quite readily in Alfred's translations, the Old English *HE*, and other medieval translations, however, do not necessarily detract from the value of these texts to their original audience. Indeed, abridgement can help a translation achieve its individual aims more effectively, thereby increasing its value. Medieval translations, Rita Copeland has argued, expected and required cultural "updating" and abridgement of the source, as the translations of Alfred and Wærferð demonstrate.

Bassnett-McGuire splits medieval translations into two categories: "vertical" and "horizontal." Where translation involves conversion of an especially privileged and valued source language (such as Latin) into the vernacular, this translation is "vertical." Translation between two languages of equal value, such as English and Norman French, is "horizontal" (Bassnett-McGuire 52). To convey the same meaning as their source, vertical translations such as the Old English *HE* pushed the boundaries of the expressive power of the target language, a pressure to which the malleability of Old English, with its seemingly endless word formation possibilities, is able to respond.

Copeland's two translatory modes, each with their own motivations and features, divide Bassnett-McGuire's "vertical" and "horizontal" categories further. The first, designated "early" or "primary", emphasises exegetical motives, attempting to provide a sort of extended complete gloss with recourse to commentaries or exegetical strategies (Copeland 94). This form of translation "serves" the source text



by transferring its meaning into a form more readily understood by readers, referring directly to the source to provide an interpretation of the meaning behind that text. Translations of the “primary” category retain a firm connection with the authority of the source text, reflexively identifying with the original by bringing their dependence on or service to that text to the fore, particularly in prefatory remarks.

“Secondary” medieval translation, although it interacts with the source text, forms a discourse of its own to reinvent and displace the original. Copeland lists Chaucer’s *Knight’s Tale* and *Troilus and Criseyde* as exempla, but Emily Redinbo’s identification of the Old English *HE* with this type of translation isolates a less radical variation of the secondary form (Redinbo 11). Although the Old English *HE* frequently employs a Latinate, literal approach to the source, other features of the translation, particularly methodical and selective excision from the source, alter the apparent motivations of the text. While the translation demonstrates alternating and concurrent use of primary and secondary translating styles (Whitelock 76), the translator’s systematic alterations create a discourse that is not working *against* that of the original necessarily, but certainly is independent from it.

Copeland’s reiteration that few medieval translations stand as pure exempla of either translation type illustrates the extent to which these models of translation methodology were able to overlap and merge in individual works. She argues that the origin of the two forms is the same, with the difference lying only in “the way that they direct their emphasis;” the first form prefers an exegetical motive, the second a rhetorical (Copeland 94). “Primary” translation, however, cannot be entirely separated from rhetorical practice, as it is still, in effect, working to supersede the source, challenging its content as it claims to supplement and serve the text. Like the secondary form, the ‘early’ form of translation also aims to construct an autonomous discourse through the model provided by its source text. Delineation of medieval translations into “types” emerges as placement of a translated text on a scale between two extremes of the same basic concept. Translators used either

methodology alternately, or employed a blend of both, as the needs of their core motivation demanded. The Old English *HE* translator's intermittent use of literal, Latinate language conversion, rhetorical or dramatic embellishment, selective editing, and larger scale excision works to form a new text, transplanting and employing the authority of the source to present a new message.

### *Translation in Alfred's England*

For Jerome and later generations of medieval translators, the translation task principally involved communication of the *content* of the source text (Timofeeva 141), as the Latin *topos* “non verbo ad verbum, sed sensum ex sensu”, promoting ‘paraphrase’ or ‘free translation’ throughout the medieval period and beyond, suggests. Extant prefaces to Alfred's translated works refer directly to this historical mode of translation in the repetitively employed phrase “Hwylum word be worde, hwylum andgit of andgite”, apparently “coined by the Alfredian circle” (Timofeeva 14). The preface to Alfred's translation of Boethius exemplifies formulaic use of the phrase:

[1.9] Ælfred kuning wæs wealhstod ðisse bec, and hie of boclædene on englisc wende, swa hio nu is gedon. Hwylum he sette word be worde, hwylum andgit of andgite, swa swa he hit þa sweotolost ond andgitfullicast gereccan mihte for þam mistlicum ond manigfealdum weoruldbisgum þe hine oft ægðer ge on mode ge on lichoman bisgodan. Ða bisgu us sint swiþe earfoþrime þe on his dagum on þa ricu becoman þe he underfangen hæfde, ond þeah ða þas boc hæfde geleornode ond of lædene to engliscum spelle gewende, ond geworhte hi eft to leoðe, swa swa heo nu gedon is. Ond nu bit ond for Godes naman he halsað ælcne þara þe þas boc rædan lyste, þæt he for hine gebidde, ond him ne wite gif he hit rihtlicor ongite þonne

he mihte. Forþamþe ælc mon seal be his andgites mæðe ond be his  
æmettan sprecan þæt he sprecð, ond don þæt þæt he deþ. (Sedgefield 1)<sup>15</sup>

The calqued “hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgit of andgite” topos, suggesting that translators should employ either a “word by word” or a “sense from sense” approach as necessity dictates, departs slightly from its Latin exemplar by advocating the measured use of each method rather than strict adherence to a ‘sense from sense’ approach. Despite Olga Timofeeva’s recent argument that this calque formed part of a formula specific to prefaces as a sub-genre, Alfred’s practical use of the topos particularly demonstrates an approach to translation which is slightly removed from the Latin model.

The Anglo-Saxon approach to translation shown in this manipulation of the model, Timofeeva argues, resulted from teaching and studying methods surrounding language at the time and throughout the medieval period (141). Proficiency and accuracy in biblical interpretation or exegesis formed the key objective of monastic education. The ‘course’ progressed through study of orthography, prosody, etymology and syntax, followed by consideration of metre and verse, difficult or rare words, grammatical features and syntax, and figures of speech or tropes as applied to passages of text. These considerations prepared the student to approach the allusions and details of the intellectual content of a text (Rener 37). Scholars thus became “enabled to understand fully each passage of the work” through a process beginning “with ‘the letter’, working out grammatical

---

<sup>15</sup> King Alfred was interpreter of this book, and turned it from book-Latin into English, as it is done now. Sometimes he set word by word, sometimes sense from sense, just as he could say it the most clearly and intelligibly because of the different and manifold worldly toils which he often occupied him both in mind and in body. The toils which came upon the kingdom which he had undertaken in his days are to us so difficult to be numbered, and yet when he had learned of this book and turned it from Latin to English language, afterwards he worked it into verse, as it is done now. And now he asks and for God’s name he implores each of those who wish to read this book, that he pray for him, and not persecute him if he more rightly understand it than he could. For each man should, by the measure of his intellect and by his leisure, speak what he speaks, and do what he does.

construction and continuity of a passage; then, one proceeds to expound its sensus or most obvious meaning; and finally, the sententia or deeper meaning is sought” (Minnis 14). Projected naturally from the translator’s training onto the translation task, this process necessitates the use of an amalgamation of “worde be worde” and “andgit of andgite” approaches to achieve an effective result (Timofeeva 141).

Alfred’s translation methodology is further explained in the letter to Bishop Wærferð, attached to his translation of Gregory’s *Cura Pastoralis*. The final passages of this text reveal translation as a collaborative process, requiring training and advice:

[1.10] ... ða óngan ic óngemang oðrum mislicum & manigfealdum bisgum ðisses kynerices ða boc wendan ón Englisc ðe is genemned ón Læden Pastoralis, & on Englisc Hierdebóc, hwilum word be worde, hwilum andgit of andgiete, swæ swæ ic hie geliornode æt Plegmunde minum ærcebiscepe & æt Assere minum biscepe & æt Grimbolde minum mæsseprioste & æt Iohanne minum mæssepreoste. Siððan ic hie ða geliornod hæfde, swæ swæ ic hie forstod, & swæ ic hie andgitfullicost areccean meahte, ic hie ón Englisc awende ... (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 7.17-25)<sup>16</sup>

Alfred’s translation of *Cura Pastoralis* is born out of a methodology formulated in accordance with his education in translation technique, received from four learned ecclesiastics: Plegmunde, Asser, Grimbold, and John. These four men, individually or collaboratively, instructed Alfred in two main stages of translation. First, the translator must ‘learn’ the text (*siððan ic hie ða geliornod hæfde*), interpreting and understanding it (*forstod; andgitfullicost areccean*) as best they can. Only after this first stage of learning is thoroughly completed will effective translation become possible. The source text is then translated into the target language, incorporating

---

<sup>16</sup> “[then] I began, among other various and manifold troubles of this kingdom, to translate into English the book which is called in Latin Pastoralis, and in English Shepherd’s Book, sometimes word by word and sometimes according to sense, as I had learnt it from Plegmund my archbishop, and Asser my bishop, and Grimbold my mass-priest, and John my mass-priest. And when I had learnt it as I could best understand it, and as I could most clearly interpret it, I translated it into English” (Sweet *Pastoral Care* 7)

the learning and understanding that took place in the first stage to achieve the final product (Timofeeva 141). What ‘understanding’ results from ‘learning’ the text naturally changes alongside its culture, so that just as Bede’s Old English translator understood Bede’s text differently from its original author, Bede would have applied quite a different understanding to the *Cura Pastoralis* or *Boethius* than Alfred did, had he been inclined to undertake the task. Bede’s translator most likely began his translation with a thorough knowledge of the text, applying to that text the understanding his own lifetime and character afforded.

### ***Bede’s Translator and his Work***

From our retrospective view, what is known of Bede’s world provides a mirror in which to view his work, influencing (and even often directing) critical reception of his writings. From the biographical and autobiographical information surviving to describe Bede to us directly, we know his gender, location, some detail about his birth, childhood, career, the manner of his death, and even a suggestion of his preferences in spices. All of these details colour the image of Bede we glean from his works. In Bede’s anonymous OE translator, however, we are provided with an opportunity to examine an author accessible only through his single identified product—the OE translation of the *HE*—without the incumbent pressure of an established identity. We are invited to see personality, not person, through the translation, and to form our understanding of the translator’s agendas and interests through what we can discern of the relationships between his work, its audience, and its source.

The translation itself is our only solid evidence of the identity of Bede’s translator. He preferred not to include his own preface and afterword, instead adopting and altering Bede’s and thereby removing opportunities for autobiography. In addition, although we may date each of the five extant copies of the Old English *HE* with relative precision, lack of an authorial autograph makes the date of

translation elusive. Like a portrait of the translator himself, an estimation of the time and place in which he worked must also originate in his product.

Just as Bede's personality can be seen behind his writing, as Stubbs observed (302), the translator's writing and editing style may also reveal aspects of his character and motivations. Whitelock considers the editing choices made by the translator when transferring the work, and notes several important discrepancies between Bede's attitudes and priorities and those demonstrated in the OE text. Despite the effect of translating into English, which requires more 'words' and space than Latin, the OE text is much shorter than Bede's. This shortening, however, is not indiscriminate. The translator's selection principles lead him to delete most quoted documents and literature such as letters, legal documents, epitaphs, and poetry, and to alter or redistribute those remaining.

Whitelock recognises the translator's excisions as not only careful but also systematic, motivated by a definite methodology and ideology ("Old English Bede" 61). A large amount of narrative concerning Celtic church affairs, the lives of foreign saints, most of the Roman history at the beginning of Bede's work, and other references to or narrative of affairs not focussed on the English Church is deleted, suggesting that the translator is concerned with the ecclesiastical history and development of the new English Church, as opposed to the activities of the Roman Church in England ("Old English Bede" 62-63). As Discenza explains:

Of the Latin sources which Bede quotes directly, only two epitaphs and four other documents remain. Bede's voice dominates the translation more than it does his own text; he stands as the main, almost the sole, authority and author. Moreover, all papal correspondence advising or admonishing Kings is gone - obliterating the history of papal attempts to exert direct authority over English Kings. The translation appears to be simply a window onto the source text when in fact it dramatically recentres the text. The interest here is truly in *English* history and authority. While the Old English *Bede*, like the Latin *Historia Ecclesiastica*, still tells the story of the English Church coming fully into the Roman fold on the dating of Easter,

Romans play virtually no direct role in English history except in conversion, an event safely in the distant past. (Discenza 77)

Selective omission of dates further suggests that Bede's interest in chronology was not shared by his translator. Whitelock concludes also that shortening or excision of geographical descriptions, such as Bede's descriptions of Britain's geography in I:I, and decreased attention to places and place names demonstrates a lack of interest in geography and etymology ("Old English Bede" 64). These excisions are offset, however, by equally methodical (though less frequent) additions made to the text according to its characteristic style, including rhetorical or poetic flourishes and explanatory comments, along with many 'doublings'.

The preferences and style of the translation give it a nature quite distinct from that of Bede's text. Raymond St. Jacques' 1983 paper, "Hwylum Worde Be Worde, Hwylum Andgit of Andgiete"? Bede's Ecclesiastical History and Its Old English Translator", draws attention to the translator's composition of passages which deviate from Bede's Latin, noting a special talent for prose narrative in his artistic literary style (86). St. Jacques notes, for example, that:

In Book II, chapter 12, we are told the story of Edwin, who while in exile in the court of Raedwald learns that his host is planning to surrender him to his enemies. Both the Latin and the Old English describe in similar terms his anguished thoughts, but while the Latin has him sitting outside the palace ("residensque mestus ante palatium", p. 178), the Old English paints an even more desolate picture by having him sit on a stone ("swiðe unrot on stane," p. 128). This detail appears in the Latin several sentences later, but the reader learns of it second hand as it were from a ghostly figure who appears to Edwin and asks him why he is sitting on a stone in such a dejected manner. Here the translator is to be commended for his sense of timing and visual effect. (97-98)

The translator's crafted turn of phrase and its relationship with Bede's original text and intentions is explored further in Donald Fry's 1986 essay "Bede Fortunate in His Translator: The Barking Nuns." Examining the chapters narrating miracles at the monastery of Barking (IV:VII-IV:XII), Fry notes the translator's ability to recognise

and replicate Bede's layered imagery and narrative devices (356). Fry's paper pays particular attention to the translator's consistent choices of vocabulary and word patterning. These choices, he argues, appreciate and often enhance the underlying artistic quality of Bede's prose, while at the same time adhering to the translator's own methodologies. Although Fry notes how the translator failed to recognise some of Bede's wordplay, often overlooking a pun in order to preserve consistent rendering of a Latin word into a particular Old English word throughout the translation text, the translator also often reveals connections overlooked in the Latin or forms his own wordplay, both preserving the spirit of Bede's narrative and asserting his own style (347-356).

### ***The Libellus Responsionum as a Case Study in Translational Method***

Among the many Roman documents inserted into his *HE*, Bede includes the *Libellus Responsionum*, an epistolary 'dialogue' between the missionary to England, Augustine, and his leader, Pope Gregory. In Bede's text of the *HE*, this document appears in its chronological position in Book I. In manuscripts of the Old English version of the *HE*, however, the *Libellus* is uplifted from its original position and inserted between Books III and IV. Editors of the translation appear to have rejected the possibility that this change was strategically intentional, and have attributed the move to later scribal or collation errors or a belated decision on the part of the translator.<sup>17</sup> However, the translator's editing choices in the case of Gregory's *Libellus* could also be viewed as being exemplary of his editing agenda in general, which directs his new text towards late ninth-century preferences, interests, and concerns. Inclusion of the *Libellus*, a Roman text of the kind generally excised entirely or replaced with a summary in the translation, draws attention both to the text of the *Libellus* and to the translator's motivations in not only including that text, but altering and redistributing it. This study takes up Sharon Rowley's suggestion

---

<sup>17</sup> The Old English version of Bede's *HE* has been edited four times: by Abraham Wheelock in 1644, John Smith in 1723, Jacob Schipper in 1897, and Thomas Miller in 1898.



that the translator, rewriting the work into Old English nearly two centuries after initial circulation of Bede's work, uplifts the *Libellus* from its position in Book I and places it after Book III with deliberate care ("Shifting Contexts" 83-92).

The *Libellus Responsionum*, or 'book of answers', as Bede reproduces it, contains nine queries and replies addressing issues of pastoral care Augustine encountered while establishing the new Church in England. Although Bede recorded many documents in his *HE*, the *Libellus* is exceptional among them in both length and presentation. It is the only document of dialogic format included in the *HE*, and, at around 410 lines in Colgrave and Mynor's edition, forms the longest chapter in the work (Higham 111). Aside from Ceowulf's letter to Nechtan, which occupies 390 lines at V:XXI and is excised from the translation, especially long documents such as the *Libellus* are generally truncated. Bede does this, for example, with Gregory's letter to Augustine on miracle performance and hubris. Of this letter, reproduced in full in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (*MGH*, *Epp.* II 305-308), Bede chooses only a block of 21 lines from a total of 87 (*MGH*, *Epp.* II. 306, ll.2-23). Moreover, as Meyvaert has noted, the version of the *Libellus* Bede included in his *HE* is "not of the highest quality", and the Latin of the text fails to make sense relatively often when compared to Bede's own Latin and that of the other Gregorian documents he preserves (20). By quoting a letter of such a length in full, without apparent correction (Meyvaert 32), and as dialogue in contrast to others in its portfolio, Bede singles the *Libellus* out for special consideration.

Moreover, alongside his presentation of the seven other Gregorian letters included in the *HE*, Bede's treatment of the *Libellus* is significantly discordant. Most obviously, six out of the seven remaining Gregorian letters are prefaced by a brief contextualisation, followed by a semi-formulaic statement of authenticity such

as “*Quarum videlicet litterarum ista est forma*”, which introduces the first letter.<sup>18</sup> Only Gregory’s letter on miracle working (which Bede heavily truncates) and the *Libellus* lack such a statement indicating that ‘this is the text of the letter’. Although Bede is careful to contextualise the *Libellus*, and places it in its correct chronological position in his narrative and among other documents, he makes no direct suggestion (as he does for the other letters) that the text he has inserted in his history is a transcription from an authenticated document.

When the practices of Bede’s OE translator are considered as an applied approach to the text, it becomes clear that, had his policies been applied with absolute rigidity, the *Libellus* would not have survived the translation and editing process. Throughout his translation of Bede’s *HE*, the translator methodically removes the documentary evidence (in the form of quoted letters etc.) Bede was so careful to include. Of the many letters Bede quoted in full or truncated form, the translator retains only one in full: the *Libellus Responsionum*.<sup>19</sup> In a search for the *Libellus* in manuscripts of the Old English translation of the *HE*, however, Gregory’s instructions on correct behaviour will not be discovered in the chronological and strategic position which Bede intended for them.

No editor of the Old English *HE* to date has acknowledged this redistribution as an intentional revision, all unanimously preferring to restore the *Libellus* to its original position in Book I. As such, the function of the document within its new context, later in the narrative of the *HE* and the development of

---

<sup>18</sup> Other Gregorian letters are introduced as follows:

Chp. 24: *quarum iste est textus*  
 28: *cuius haec forma est*  
 29: *Quarum litterarum iste est textus*  
 30: *ostendit ita scribens*  
 32: *Exemplar autem praefatae epistulae hoc est*

<sup>19</sup> The translator also retains fragments of a letter from the Britons to Aetius, presented at I:XIII (CM 46-7), or I:X (Miller 46-47) in the OE version.

English Christianity, has received little consideration. The significance of context in interpretation is well recognised in studies of literature. A text passes through several levels of a reader's understanding, including their understanding of themselves, their own world, the world of the author, the time period the content of the text reflects, the progress and intentions of the narrative, and any known discourse surrounding the text. Placed between Books III and IV, the translator's version of the *Libellus* is in a position to absorb and influence the content of both these books. Further, historical exemplars of the kinds of social issues to which the *Libellus* was being applied in the translator's contemporary culture presented in Books III and IV allow the text to interact with events and issues current both in its new narrative context, and in ninth-century social and political discourse. As such, the continuing relevance of the advice contained in the *Libellus* allows the text to mediate between the world of Bede's experience, the world of the *HE*, and the world of the translator and his immediate audience.

Abraham Wheelock's pioneering seventeenth-century edition of the Old English translation places the two versions in parallel columns, and represents a first voice in discourse on the tension between the Latin and Old English texts. His edition must be considered from the outset alongside his motivations for executing it, in much the same way as the translation itself must be considered. As a product of his particular social climate, Wheelock's edition attempts to assert the primacy and justice of the Protestant faith in England. The Old English translation, with its habitual excision of Roman documentation and papal correspondence, seems particularly vulnerable to exploitation in this regard. The authority represented by Bede, his reputation, and his pious works, plays a central role in achieving Wheelock's Protestant agenda. The presentation of Bede's text beside the translator's Old English can thus be seen as a projection of Bede's authority onto the translated text. At the same time, Wheelock exploits the nationalist assertion of distinctively English Christianity in the Anglo-Saxon period represented by the

translation, helping to ground Protestant ideals in an early English past (Murphy 47).

Wheelock's interest in the comparative value of the Old English text is attested in the methodology of his edition. Aligning the Old English and Latin texts side by side, Wheelock's work identifies and augments discrepancies between the two works, highlighting especially the many omissions that are a particular feature of the translation text. The primacy of Latin is manifest, however, in its dominance in the overall presentation of the work; not only is the full text of Bede's Latin *Historia* much greater in length than its Old English counterpart, but Wheelock's authorial materials (annotations, prefatory material and so on) are also composed in Latin. Conversely, the bulk of the edition is suggestive of a preference for the Old English text in its layout and presentation. The 1644 edition of Wheelock's work distinguishes the Old English by presenting the Old English text in a different and larger type, and places the Old English on the left hand, leading side of the page. The smaller, enclosed Latin text thus appears as supplementary to the Old English, afforded equal size and space only where the Old English provides no equivalent.

In his edition, Wheelock moves the translator's *Libellus* into a position aligning with Bede's Latin text in Book I, as his intention to provide parallel readings of the two texts demands. Wheelock's decision to 'rectify' the translator's editing choice regarding the *Libellus* is, to some degree, unsurprising. Wheelock's veneration of Latin, evident in the dominating use of Latin in his introductory, annotative and indexing material, naturally suggests a reluctance to interfere with Bede's Latin text. His evident willingness to alter the Old English text, however, does not seem consistent with the suggested primary focus on the Old English version purported by his chosen presentation. Wheelock's layout, which asserts a dominant concern for the Old English text and presents the translation as verified by

Bede's Latin, disguises his editorial decisions regarding the *Libellus* and suggests an authorised reproduction of an 'accurate' text.

In 1722, John Smith published his edition of Bede's *HE*, acknowledging Wheelock in his introduction. Smith's edition departs from Wheelock's in that, while it also presents an edition of the Latin, its Latin and Old English texts are placed back to back, with the Latin taking precedence. As such, Smith's edition of the Old English is not under the same degree of pressure to conform to a parallel reading format, but is allowed to stand on its own to some extent. Nevertheless, Smith also uplifts the *Libellus* and shifts it back to Book I, acknowledging the move with a brief footnote:

36 *Interrogatio*] In Saxonis MSS. omnibus Interrogationes hæ & Responsiones sine libri Tertii ponuntur. (Smith 488)

One and a half centuries later in 1897, Jacob Schipper would perform this correction again in his edition, presented in parallel columns, of two of the five extant manuscripts of the translation—MSS. *O* and *B*. Despite the obvious precedence he affords the Old English version of the text, Schipper continues the tradition established by Wheelock and Smith of associating the translation directly with its Latin original, providing the Latin in the bottom third of the page and allowing the Latin ordering to dominate.

Thomas Miller's 1898 edition of the translation, which appeared around the same time as Schipper, is the first to present the Old English translation without Bede's Latin text in accompaniment, offering Miller's own translation of the Old English instead. Unlike Wheelock, Miller does not attempt to utilise the translation for his own political or religious argument, but rather is motivated by a desire to produce an accurate and accessible text of the work (vi). Miller's edition as we have it renders the Latin text practically invisible, its primary remnant lying in his

occasional reliance on Bede's text for guidance when encountering a particularly difficult Old English passage in his own translation.<sup>20</sup>

Despite this preference for the Old English work, Miller repeats the 'correction' of Wheelock, Smith, and Schipper. Although he does provide a footnote at the opening of the *Libellus* acknowledging the physical position of the translator's version of the text at the end of Book III in all MSS (Miller 64, n.1), Miller's edition effectively purports to be a faithful, authoritative representation of the translation text. Generally, this assertion is valid; his shift of the *Libellus* is the only radical interference he performs on the text of the translation, and the Old English text he provides is reliable enough to remain the primary authoritative edition of the translation in use in Anglo-Saxon scholarship up to this day.

Miller's footnote and the introduction to his edition demonstrate an awareness of the implications of such an interference. In his introductory remarks, Miller provides justification for his decision, suggesting that the inclusion of the *Libellus* at the end of Book III may have been the result of a change of mind—that the text was included as “an afterthought”, and was not inserted into Book I as its space there had been filled (Miller, xxiii). He further vindicates his interference by asserting that the *Interrogations* “formed a separate work (*libello responsionum*) and were written by Pope Gregory I” effectively divorcing the *Libellus* text from the authorship of the translator and reinforcing its ‘mobility’. Miller's treatment of the *Libellus* suggests an underlying theory that the translator had originally intended to delete the work, hence its absence from its original position in Book I, but later thought better of this decision and inserted the text at the earliest possible

---

<sup>20</sup> It is important to note here that Miller's edition is incomplete. The “second part”, containing glossary, full critical notes and so on, which he promises in his preface never emerged (vii). In this “second part”, Miller may have provided a fuller explanation for the translator's placement of the *Libellus*. The preface does not, however, indicate that Miller intended to include a Latin text to correspond with his Old English edition.

convenience. This 'change of mind', then, seems to have occurred sometime during the translating of Book III.

In the twentieth century, Dorothy Whitelock went some way towards filling the gap Miller's failure to justify the actions of the translator left in this theory. During her consideration of the relationship of the translation text with the large amount of papal correspondence included in Bede's Latin text in her 1962 lecture "The Old English Bede", Whitelock proposes that ninth-century papal correspondence could provide a contemporary context for the translator's inclusion of the *Libellus* (Whitelock 70). Specifically, Whitelock draws on reference to the *Libellus* in a letter from Pope John VIII to Burgred of Mercia between 872 and 874, in which the Pope invokes the guidelines on marriage laid out by Gregory in his responses to Questions Four and Five:

...many men of your kingdom presume to marry nuns and women dedicated to God, and women of their own kindred, disregarding the statute of St. Gregory... (CS 1)

Compounding this suggestion that the *Libellus* formed part of discourse surrounding contemporary anxieties about consanguinity in marriage, a second ninth-century papal letter further supports Whitelock's argument. This time addressing Archbishop Æðelred in 877 or 878, Pope John instructs the archbishop that he should not "permit anyone to marry within his own kindred, by the established decree of our holy predecessor, Gregory" (CS 3). Whitelock uses these two epistles in a concerted effort to ground the translator's inclusion of the *Libellus* in contemporary discourse. However, despite her assertions that the translator had a motive for retaining the text, that he authored the translation of the *Libellus* himself from the same type of Latin text as he did the rest of the translation text, and that evidence encourages dismissal of the suggestion that the *Libellus* was omitted from Book I due to a lacuna in the Latin MS, Whitelock is unable to propose any "logical reason for their removal from the proper place in book i to a position between book iii and iv" (70). Along with Miller, Whitelock concludes that the translator 'decided'

to include the *Libellus* at some stage during the translation of Book III, and inserted the text at the earliest logical opportunity.

Plummer notes the discrepancy between Bede's Latin text and the translator's at this juncture briefly in his edition of the *HE*, attributing the change to "the translator's own fancy; who also abridges considerably" (2:46). Although Plummer does not develop this stance, his comment suggests that, upon observing the arrangement of the *Libellus* in the translated text, he assumed the shift was deliberate, and an effect of the translator's general approach to the work. The argument of Miller and Whitelock stood otherwise unchallenged until Sharon Rowley's investigation of the *Libellus* text in the Old English *HE* appeared in 2001 (Bremmer et al. *Rome and the North* 83-92). In this study, Rowley proposes a new theory regarding the translator's treatment of the *Libellus*; that the text was not only intentionally included in the translation, but that its positioning at the end of Book III is deliberate. She argues that:

...by moving the *Libellus*, the translator generates a text that allows Gregory's teachings to resonate with Bede's account of the re-Christianisation of England after periods of apostasy, the conversion of new parts of the island, and, finally, with the reassertion of a specifically Roman orthodoxy in England. (Rowley 85)

Rowley's argument connects the content of the *Libellus* to events of Book III, and the events of Book III to those of the ninth century, and concludes that such applicability is not coincidental. By repositioning the *Libellus*, Rowley argues, the translator is able to recreate Bede's original use of the text for his contemporary audience "materially and interpretively" (Rowley 90).

In this study, I intend to examine the internal features of the *Libellus*, alongside its position in the structure of the Old English *HE* and in discourse contemporary with the OE translator, and to propose an extension to Rowley's theory of deliberate placement. Rowley delineates the function of the *Libellus* as a tool to reassert social and moral strictures, both at the new position of the text in



the OE version and in the turbulent political climate of the ninth century. This delineation operates well with Book III, which not only contains narrative representations of the kinds of marital transgressions which drew the *Libellus* into ninth-century correspondence, but also provides an extended narrative of the attacks of the 'heathen' king Penda. This narrative mirrors the aggressive spread of the pagan Viking settlers, a different but no less concerning threat to social order and Christian culture.

However, the translator's *Libellus* and its new narrative position also performs an important role in the morally didactic objective outlined for the text in its preface. As chapter 2 will examine, the translator's application of a consistent stylistic alteration to the work—'doubling'—reveals repeated augmentation of ideas related to moral improvement and behaviour. The resulting text, with its increased moral tone, then interacts with edifying narrative episodes, which in the Old English *HE* appear in higher concentration in the last three Books of the work. This interaction will form the central investigation of chapter 3. Finally, a detailed case study of *Interrogation* 5 in chapter 4 will demonstrate how internal changes (such as those examined in chapter 2), and interaction between the *Libellus* and the morally saturated content of Books III, IV, and V, interface with contemporary ninth-century discourse to bring the moral objective of the text into the world of the translator's audience.

## Chapter 2—Rinse and Repeat: *Consideratio* and the Path to Clean Living in the Doublings of the OE *Libellus*

Throughout his translation of the *Libellus*, Bede's OE translator employs a category of subtle vocabulary alteration known as 'doubling'. Frequently, the resulting reading heightens the moral tone of the text, thus promoting the edifying agenda expressed in the *HE*'s preface. The character of the *Libellus* as a moralising text is evident in its original purpose and general content, and in its MS provenance among penitential collections outside the *HE*. Although the translator's experience of the *Libellus* prior to his translation of the *HE* lies outside the confines of this study, his knowledge of the content of the text is self-evident. Unlike a scribe or copyist, a translator must comprehend each word he reads in order to make sound decisions as to its replacement word in the new language. The character of the OE *Bede* translator's comprehension is reflected both in his vocabulary choices, and in the alterations he makes to the text for his version. Through these alterations, the translator is able to bend the existing content of the *Libellus* and promote particular messages within it, to advance his own understanding of and intentions for the text. The translator's use of 'doubling' provides him with an opportunity to subtly alter the text to clarify or augment existing senses, or to infuse an original sense with new ideas, by providing multiple translations of single words. Frequently, the requirements of the translator's moralising agenda for the *HE* appear to have dictated which words and themes receive such treatment.

In particular, much of the vocabulary the translator selects for augmentation through 'doubling' within the *Libellus* amplifies the 'voice' of that text's original author, Gregory I. Over most of the *HE* text the OE translator is continually required to reconcile the voice of Bede, as the author of his source, with his own voice and cultural context. The *Libellus*, however, was not authored by Bede, but was transcribed into his *HE* unaltered, revealing his presence only in its placement and integration within the overall structure of the *HE*. As such,

excepting issues of placement to be discussed in later chapters, when faced with translating the *Libellus* for his version of Bede's *HE*, the OE translator primarily negotiates not with the voice of Bede, but with that of Gregory, the author of the *Libellus* itself. In particular, Gregory's moralistic conception of *consideratio*—a philosophy of balancing the demands of spiritual life with those of the material world through careful judgement—attracts the attention of the translator and aligns with his moralistic intentions.

### **'Doubling' in the OE *Libellus* and *HE***

The translator's text of the *HE* is not only distinguished from its source by its composition in a different language, but also by the many alterations made to Bede's text during the translation process. These changes identify the translation not as a mirror of Bede's work and motivations, but as a work with its own agenda. I considered many aspects of the translator's strategy in effecting this agenda in my quest to find an entry point into his purposes for the *Libellus*, a quoted document atypically retained for the OE version of the *HE*. This 'entry point' needed to be reflective of the translator's motivations, but also needed to align with his methodologies as demonstrated *throughout* the *HE*, thus showing the integration of his general intentions and strategies for the *HE* translation with those particular to the *Interrogations* themselves. As an accessible stylistic feature found consistently throughout the text, with particular potential for expression of ideas (whether conscious or subconscious) encountered during the writing process, the translator's use of rhetorical *hendiadys* through 'doubling' finally emerged as an ideal key.

Doubling, or use of a pair of words to express a single word or concept (*hendiadys*), is a feature of Anglo-Saxon linguistic culture and "a notable feature of the Old English version of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*" (Kuhn 168). Potter marks this feature as another connection between the Old English *HE* and its schoolmate, Wærferð's *Dialogues*, noting that these two texts employ 'doubling' more often than other key Alfredian translations, such as the *Liber Regula Pastoralis*, *Orosius*,

*Boethius*, and Augustine's *Soliloquies*, and have a similar range (Potter 24). 'Doubling' is by no means confined to these two texts or the Old English language exclusively, however, appearing in some way in most old and modern languages and in all stages of English. Bede, himself a native Old English speaker, frequently uses doublings in his Latin text, and the translator retains many of these. Some, such as *geleafan* 7 *arfæstnesse* (Miller 34.18) for Bede's *fidei ac pietas* (CM 28.18), replicate the original faithfully. Others show an apparently deliberate reversal of the Latin word order, as in the translator's *pearfum* 7 *untrumum* (Miller 178.13) for Bede's *infirmis et pauperibus* (CM 242.14). Still more of the doublings found in the Old English *HE* replace a single Latin word.

Scholarship has offered three primary explanations for "doubling" in the Old English version of the *HE*. The first, lead by P. Fijn van Draat in 1915 ("The Authorship of the Old English Bede: A Study in Rhythm"), examines the rhythmic effect of synonymic repetition.<sup>21</sup> Van Draat comments:

With the exception of the Bede and the Dialogues, the end for which the translator resorts to this curious trick of repetition is always the same. In most cases the translator seems to be aware that he cannot render the sense of the original accurately by means of a single word, and for this reason he adds a second, synonymous word, to make his meaning clearer: especially is this the case where technical terms have to be translated. Sometimes, however, the two words render the thought, the one literally, the other figuratively. At other times a generally received word is followed by some dialect form, or the two words express cause and effect. Then again the two verbs which render the one Latin verb express two successive stages of the action, as in *bezyað and habbað*. ... But when we turn to the Old English translations of Bede and of Gregory's Dialogues matters assume a different aspect. For though not rarely the tautological phrases may be accounted for in the way indicated above, yet, in the majority of instances they are due to the translator's conscious endeavour to render by means of *planus*, *tardus*, or *velox*, the *cursus*-form which he found in his Latin text. (321-2)

---

<sup>21</sup> This article follows on from two previous studies of *cursus* in English literature: "Voluptas Aurium" (1914), and "The Cursus in Old English Poetry" (1914).

Although he acknowledges other reasons a tautologous pair of words may be used to replace a single Latin word, van Draat argues that these synonymic phrases are the translator's primary means of replicating the Latin text's "rhythmic prose" style (322), particularly through *cursus*.

Later, Sherman Kuhn proposed a lexical explanation for the translator's doublings. In "Synonyms in the Old English Bede", Kuhn drew attention to the relationship between the translator's use of "synonymous pairs of words or phrases to translate single expressions in the original Latin" (168) and the tradition of interlinear glossing evident in the *Vespasian Psalter*, *Rushworth Gospels*, and the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. Through a comparison of the nature and style of the translator's "doublets" with the glosses found in the above MSS, Kuhn proposed that "the Mercian original underlying the Old English Bede was a gloss", and concluded that the OE *Bede* translator's doublings "are to be regarded, not as a species of ornamentation introduced by an independent translator, but as a rhetorical accident growing out of the manner in which the translation was made" (176).

In "Rhetoric and the Translation of Bede", to which Kuhn's argument was partly a rebuttal, J. M. Hart had isolated the practice of providing two OE words to express a single expression in the Latin version as a "rhetorical peculiarity" of the work (Hart 150). Although doublings in the OE translation frequently simply replicate the sense of their Latin source word or words, they are also used to redirect the tone of the text. Such redirection may involve rhythm rather than meaning, provide poetic flourish through alliteration, emphasise concepts through repetition, or perform a combination of these roles. A doubling may also redirect reading towards a particular understanding of the context, highlighting or inserting messages in the text according to the translator's wishes. Such subtle stylistic manipulation asserts the translator's identity as separate from that of his source author, and is a particular feature of the translation's style and vocabulary. Although many of the

doublings found in the OE translator's *Libellus* follow Kuhn's argument and do not clearly "reflect a conscious and deliberate application, on the part of the translator, of a rhetorical principle" (168), many more support Hart's proposal that the OE *Bede* translator's doublings do indeed contribute deliberately to the rhetorical fabric of the translated text.

The translator replaces a single Latin word with two comparable Old English words or phrases, or inserts two words expressing one concept with no corresponding word or words in the source text, fifty-seven times in his version of the *Libellus*.<sup>22</sup> In each of these cases (and in all cases of doubling generally), the paired terms effect both lexical and rhetorical amplification, which may be conscious or subconscious on the part of the translator. Where the two words chosen to replace a single Latin source word are particularly close in sense, the translator's motivation may be metrical rather than semantic, constructed out of an awareness of the rhythm of the sentence in which they occur (Potter 24). Alternatively, as Kuhn argued, some of the translator's doublings may evidence a carry-over from a tradition of interlinear glossing. Further, after investigation of the translator's general practice in translating certain Latin words, many of his doublings emerge as habitual treatments. For instance in *Interrogation* 1, the Latin *erudire* (CM 80:3) is replaced with *tydde 7 lærde* (Miller 64:12). The translator uses this rendering for *erudire* fairly consistently throughout the text, repeating it in this *Interrogation* seven lines later, when he replaces Bede's *erudita* (CM 80:9) with *getýd 7 gelæred* (Miller 64:19). Of the seven uses of forms of *týn* and *læran* paired together to replace one Latin word in the Old English *HE*, five are substitutions for a form of *erudire* (Waite 215-16).<sup>23</sup> Likewise, further on in this *Interrogation*, the translator replaces *erogandum* (CM 80:25) with *to reccenne 7 to sellenne* (Miller 66.10-11). Bede uses forms of *erogare* only three times in his Latin text. The translator renders it once as

---

<sup>22</sup> For a complete list of these doublings, refer to Appendix A.

<sup>23</sup> Comparative Latin/OE concordances of vocabulary examined in this chapter can be found in Appendix B.

a single OE word, substituting *gedǣlenne* (Miller 294:21) for *erogandam* (CM 366:7), and twice as a doubling consisting of forms of *reccan* and *sellan*—here in the first *Interrogation*, and in III:V, where *erogare* (CM 226:10) is replaced with *réhte 7 sealde* (Miller 160:15). Such doublings appear to be created automatically, and to emphasise as an incidental effect of “rhetorical accident.”

Other doublings alter the text with apparent deliberation. For instance, the translator may construct a doubling to increase the dramatic impact of a passage or image. As St. Jacques has noted, the translator frequently embellishes his version of the narrative for dramatic or rhetorical effect, intensifying emotional impressions, enhancing the danger of situations such as storms at sea, sharpening juxtapositions, and amplifying depictions of suffering (97-100). Such tendencies may be evident in *Interrogations* 8 and 9, for example, where the translator forms several doublings emphasising expressions of pain and grief:

[2.1]

gooung 7 sár (Miller 76.15)	gemitus (CM 90.15)
sár 7 wiite (Miller 76.18-19)	poenam (CM 90.17)
wepen 7 hreowe don (Miller 82.28)	defleant (CM 96.29)
goað 7 geomrað (Miller 88.15)	ingemiscat (CM 102.3)
goiende 7 geomriende (Miller 88.16-17)	gemebat (CM 102.4)

Amplifications of quantity/quality expressions, such as *se mæsta ... 7 se beasta* (Miller 88.16) for *praecipuus* (CM 102.4) in *Interrogation* 9, also add dramatic tone to the text.

Many doublings found in the *Libellus* occur only once or rarely in the *HE* translation as a whole, despite other occurrences of their Latin source words, and represent the application of interpretations particular to the translator’s understanding of the Latin word, in the context of his agenda for the *Libellus* text. Doublings like this which contribute to the moralising rhetoric of the translator’s

version of the *Libellus* will command particular attention in this chapter. To isolate doublings which may reflect a “conscious application of a rhetorical principle”, each doubling within the *Libellus* has been cross-referenced with other instances in which the translator has rendered the same Latin source word within the *HE* as a whole.<sup>24</sup> Such examination isolates those doublings which appear to deviate from the translator’s regular practice in dealing with that particular source word, revealing, for example, which doubling pairs are used repeatedly and which rarely or only in a single instance.

### *Moralism in the Doublings of the OE Libellus*

As the number of such doublings found in the *Libellus* increased over the course of this examination, one pattern in particular emerged. At least two thirds of the doublings found within the translator’s *Libellus* express and engage with concepts that relate directly to the intentions both Bede and his translator express for their *HE* texts in the preface (see extract 1.4/1.4b). Whether they emphasise the ideas behind their Latin source, or introduce or modify ideas, these doublings reinforce the concept of moral improvement. They communicate consideration and learning; purity, impurity, and cleansing; lifestyle or behaviour; social identity and behavioural expectations; penance, discipline and correction; prohibition; and prayer, and interact with excisions, additions, and other modifications to strengthen the presence of these ideas in the OE version of the text.

### *Learning and Knowledge*

In several instances within the *Libellus*, the translator draws attention to ideas of expression and absorption, repeating words indicating speech, learning, and knowledge to utilise the authorising effects of reiteration. In this way the translator recaptures traces of the anxiety to impress the authority on the reader that is so prominent in Bede’s Latin text and its scholarly methodology. For instance, the last

---

<sup>24</sup> Full results of this cross-referencing process can be found in Appendix B.



doubling encountered in the translation of the first *Interrogation*, *lærde 7 cwæð* (Miller 66:12) for *docente* (CM 80:26), adds authority to *docente*, which here refers to the teachings of Christ:

[2.2] ... cum omne quod superest in causis piis ac religiosis erogandum est, Domino magistro omnium **docente**: ‘Quod superest, date elemosinam, et ecce omnia munda sunt uobis.’ (CM 80.24-27)<sup>25</sup>

[2.2b] Mid þy eall, þætte ofer bið to láfe on heora weoruldspedum, arfæstum 7 gódum is to reccenne 7 to sellenne, swa swa ealra magister Drihten Crist **lærde 7 cwæð**: Quod superest, date elemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis: ðætte ofer seo 7 to láfe, sellað ælmesse, 7 eow beoð eal clæno. (Miller 66.9-14)<sup>26</sup>

The translator adds *cwæð* here to expand *docente*. Forms of *docere* appear around seventy-six times in Bede’s text, and occurrences of *edocere*, *predocere*, and *praedicare* may extend this count still further. *Læran* and *lár* are used frequently to translate *docere* and its semantic relatives, and represent a habitual vocabulary choice indicating the translator’s literal understanding of the original Latin word. *Læran* is paired with *cweðan* in a doubling only this once, although two other uses of *læran* are paired with similar words, *cyðan* (*cýde 7 lærde* IV:III (Miller 268:13) and *secgan* (*sægde 7 lærde* IV:II (Miller 258:31-2). The resultant doubling refers explicitly to verbal teaching, and reinforces the proximity of the teacher, Christ, to his audience, strengthening the authority of the instruction to which the doubling and its original apply by affirming that it came directly from the mouth of Christ.

*Weotan 7 leorniað* functions in a similar way in *Interrogation* 8, reinforcing the *Interrogation*’s reasoning of the sinlessness of menstruation through emphasis of the knowledge and learning behind that ruling:

<sup>25</sup> “For all that is over is to be spent for holy and religious purposes as the Lord and Master of all teaches: ‘Give alms of what you have over and behold all things are clean unto you.’” (CM 81)

<sup>26</sup> Because all, that is left over to remain in their worldly wealth, is to be shared out and given to the pious and good, just as the Lord Christ teacher of us all taught and said: *Quod superest, date elemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis*: That which is over and in remainder, give as alms, and to you all things are clean.

[2.3] **Nouimus** namque quod mulier, quae fluxum patiebatur sanguinis, post tergum Domini humiliter ueniens uestimenti eius fimbriam tetigit, atque ab ea statim sua infirmitas recessit. (CM 92.5-8)<sup>27</sup>

[2.3b] Hwæt we weotan 7 leorniað in Cristes bocum, þætte þæt wiif, þe wæs þrowiende blodes flownisse, heo eaðmodlice wæs cumende æfter Drihtnes bæce 7 gehran þæt fæs his hrægles, 7 sona instæpe hire untrymnes onweg gewat 7 heo wæs hal geworden. (Miller 78.10-12)<sup>28</sup>

In this case, the translator further specifies the source of the knowledge and learning reiterated here, in his addition of *in Cristes bocum* to indicate the Gospel origins of Gregory's comments.<sup>29</sup>

*Areccende 7 cwæð* (*subiecit exponens* CM 94.11; Miller 80.11), and *underðeodde 7 æftercwæð* (*adnuntians subiungit* CM 94.18, Miller 80.18; *subiungere* CM 96.32, Miller 82.32), enact very similar manipulations. *Areccende 7 cwæð*, reinforces an explanation:

[2.4] Nam cum multa lex uelut immunda manducare prohibeat, in euangelico tamen Dominus dicit: 'Non quod intrat in os coinquinat hominem, sed quae exeunt de ore, illa sunt quae coinquant hominem', atque paulo post **subiecit exponens**: 'Ex corde exeunt cogitationes malae.' (CM 94.8-13)<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> "For we know that the woman who was suffering from the issue of blood humbly came behind the Lord's back and touched the hem of his garment and immediately her infirmity left her." (CM 93)

<sup>28</sup> "What we know and learn in Christ's book, is that that woman, who was suffering flow of blood, she humbly was approaching behind the Lord's back and touched the hem of his garment, and instantly forthwith her sickness went away and she was made whole."

<sup>29</sup> This addition could also evidence a requirement for the translator to compensate for a lack of learning among his audience. As Alfred himself noted in his prefaces, learning and knowledge during his reign had degraded significantly in comparison to that of earlier generations, such as those of Bede and of Gregory and Augustine, who would have recognised the passage as having a Gospel source.

<sup>30</sup> "For as the law forbids the eating of many things as unclean, nevertheless in the gospel the Lord said: 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, that defileth a man.' And shortly afterwards He added in explanation, 'Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts.'" (CM 95)

[2.4b] Forþon, mid þy seo æ monig þing bewereð to etanne, swa swa unclæne, hwæðre in godspelle Drihten cwæð: Nales þætte ingongeð in muð monnan besmíteð, ac þa ðe utgongað of múde, þa seondan þe þone monnan besmíteð. 7 wene æfter þon wæs þæt **areccende 7 cwæð**: Of heortan utgongað yfele geþóhtas. (Miller 80.7-11)<sup>31</sup>

*Underðeodde 7 æftercwæð* supports a condition in a similar way:

[2.5] Nam cum Paulus apostolus diceret: 'Qui se continere non potest, habeat uxorem suam', statim **subiungere** curauit: 'Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium.' (CM 96.30-33)<sup>32</sup>

[2.5b] Forðon se apostol Sanctus Paulus mid ðy cwæð, Qui se continere non potest, habeat uxorem suam, se ðe hine ahabban ne mæg, hæbbe his wiif, he ða sona se apostol **underðeodde 7 æfter cwæð**: Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium: ðis ic cweðo æfter forgifnesse, nales æfter bebodo. (Miller 82.30-34)<sup>33</sup>

Each of these instances also echo *Interrogation 1's lærde 7 cwæð* (Miller 66:12), in their added invocation of speech, to add additional authorisation.

A doubling replacing *disco* in *Interrogation 5, oncneowon 7 ongeton (didicimus* CM 84.7; Miller 70.6), invests authority in learning and knowledge in a similar way, but relies on observation and experience rather than biblical authorisation:

[2.6] Sed experimento **didicimus** ex tali coniugio sobolem non posse succrescere, et sacra lex prohibet cognationis turpitudinem reuelare. (CM 84.6-8)<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Thus, when the law prohibits to eat many things, as unclean, nevertheless in the Gospel the Lord says: Not that which goes into the mouth of man defiles, but that which goes out of the mouth, that is what defiles the man. And it was a little after that he explained and said: Evil thoughts go out of the heart.

<sup>32</sup> "For when the Apostle Paul said, 'Let him who cannot contain himself have his own wife', he took care to add forthwith, 'But this I say by way of indulgence, not of commandment'." (CM 97)

<sup>33</sup> Because when the apostle St. Paul said, *Qui se continere non potest, habeat uxorem suam* he who may not abstain, have his wife, then the apostle immediately added and after-said: *Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium* this I say by permission, not at all by command.

<sup>34</sup> "But we have learned from experience that the offspring of such marriages cannot thrive. Sacred law forbids a man to uncover the nakedness of his kindred." (CM 85)

[2.6b] Ac we þæt cuðlice **oncneowon 7 ongeton**, þætte þæt tuddur growan  
ne weaxan meahte of swylcum gesinscipe; ond seo halige & bewereð 7  
forbeodeð þa scondlicnesse onwreon mægsibba. (Miller 70.6-9)<sup>35</sup>

Alongside *ongeton*, “perceive” (Bosworth Toller), which suggests immediacy, *oncneowon* expresses the previously gained knowledge conveyed by the Latin’s *experimento didicimus* (‘we know from experience’). These two words contrast to fill the sense lost in the translator’s deletion of *experimento*.<sup>36</sup> As such, the translator’s rendering of *didicimus* communicates authority both from previous learning and from immediate perception, enhancing the Latin’s sense of attestation.

### *Lifestyle and Personal Conduct*

In each of the above cases, the translator’s doubled rendering lends additional authority, through knowledge and learning, to support the recommendation of a correct mode of Christian behaviour. The translator frequently emphasises and/or subtly manipulates expressions of performed behaviour, drawing attention to personal conduct and lifestyle. In *Interrogation 1*, for example, the translator replaces the Latin’s *conversentur* (CM 78:18) with *drohtian 7 lifgan* (Miller 64:6-7):

---

<sup>35</sup> But we know and perceive, that the offspring may not grow nor develop from such a marriage; and the holy law warns and forbids the shame of relatives be uncovered.

<sup>36</sup> *Oncneowon 7 ongeton* (*didicimus* CM 84.7; Miller 70.6) is not repeated elsewhere in the translation, although *disco* is doubled in translation several times (Waite 209). *Oncneowon 7 ongeton*’s fellow doublings share one element, (*ge*)leornian or (*ge*)læran, and add one variable element (*didicit in spiritu* CM 176.8-9, *geleornade he in gaste 7 he onwrigen wæs* Miller 126.7; *didicit*: CM 288.27, *onget he 7 geleornade (in gaste)* Miller 234.7-8; CM 334.15, *sægde 7 lærde* Miller 258.31-2; CM 532.8, *geseah 7 geleornode* Miller 468.1). The translator’s doubling for *didicimus* in *Interrogation 5*, however, does not share this most common element, but renders instead with a pairing selected for rhythmic effect, repeating *on*, and to manipulate the reader’s response. *Oncnāwan* is also used in the translation to render *persentire* (Miller 38.2); *probare* (Miller 196.6); and *cognoscere* (Miller 330.11), and doubled with repetitions of *Interrogation 5*’s *oncneowon 7 ongeton*, *onget 7 oncneow* (Miller 328.23) for *audire*, and *oncneow 7 ongeat* (Miller 330.15) for *intelligere* (Waite 531).

[2.7] De episcopis, qualiter cum suis clericis **conuersentur**, uel de his, quae fidelium oblationibus accedunt altario, quanta debeant fieri portiones, et qualiter episcopus agere in ecclesia debeat. (CM 78.17-20)<sup>37</sup>

[2.7b] Ærest bi biscopum, hu hy mid heora geferum **drohtian 7 lifgan** sculon? Oðþo in þam lacum geleafsumra, þe heo to wigbedum 7 to Godes cirican bringað, hu monige dælas þara beon scyle? Ond hu biscop in cirican don scyle? (Miller 64:6-9)<sup>38</sup>

Here *drohtian* (“to converse [i.e.. interact], live” (Bosworth & Toller)) provides an effective replacement for *conversor*, meaning not only to live or dwell but also carrying implications of social interaction (“to live with, have intercourse with, keep company with” (Lewis & Short)).

Noun forms of *drohtian* and *lifgan*, *drohtunge* and *liif*, are used several lines later to render Bede’s use of the corresponding Latin noun, *conversatio*, incorporating a demonstrative:<sup>39</sup>

[2.8] hanc ... conuersationem (CM 80:11)

[2.8b] þas drohtunge 7 þis liif (Miller 64:21-2)

---

<sup>37</sup> “How should the bishops live with their clergy? How are the offerings which the faithful bring to the altar to be apportioned, and how ought a bishop to act in the church?” (CM 79)

<sup>38</sup> First about the bishops, how should they dwell and live with their companions? Also in the offerings of the faithful, that they bring to the altars and to God’s church, how many shares shall there be? And how shall a bishop act in the church?

<sup>39</sup> Over the translation as a whole, noun or verb forms of *conversor* are replaced with forms of *drohtian* twice (*conversata* CM 406.5: *drohtiende* Miller 322.2; *conversatus* 464.29: *drohtigende* 398.16), *lifgan* once (*conversatus* 426.16: *lifde* 356.8), and rendered into the two doublings found here in the first *Interrogation*. The noun *conversatio* also used here occurs more frequently over the entire text, and is translated fourteen times. A breakdown of replacements for *conversatio* reveals the translator’s habitual translation of *conversor* and *conversatio* to be *droht(n)ian* or *droht*, this being the most common individual translation and the common element all doublings formed to replace either Latin word share. The translator renders *conversatio* with *droht* on its own in forty-three percent of cases. Other substitutions include *lif* individually or as part of a compound such as *munuclifes* (Miller 172.16) rendering *monachicae <monasticae> conversationis* (CM 238.8), and *munuchade* (Miller 340.4) for *monachica conversatione* (CM 412.17). The remainder of the translator’s replacements for *conversatio* are doublings containing forms of *droht* and *lif* (with the occasional addition of a pronoun) exclusively, a frequent replacement the translation shares with the vocabulary of Wærferð’s *Dialogues* (Potter, 26).

Between the two instances of such replacement found in the translation of *Interrogation 1*, however, the OE translator uses an alternative pairing. Retaining the connection between *conversor* in the Latin and *drohtian* in the translation, the translator pairs *drohtian* with *don* for a single, alliterative instance:

[2.9] *conuersari* (CM 80:4)

[2.9b] *drohtian 7 don* (Miller 64:13)

In this instance the translator utilises the doubling partner to explicate his contextual understanding of *conversari*. While the addition of *lifgan* in the first doubling applied to *conversor* imposes a reading of ‘dwell’ or ‘live’ on its partner *drohtian*, the second instance redirects the reading, through the implications of *don*, towards ‘action’ or behavior. This case illustrates a general tendency of the translator to use doubling as an exegetical tool. Where Bede has used the same word, *conversari* and its forms, the translator has differentiated two subtly different concepts, providing an extension in his doubling to encourage a particular reading of the idea behind *conversari* according to the meaning he has perceived in the context, or wishes to impose.

Consideration of the relationship between the first and last parts of *Interrogation 1*’s question, which address the behaviour of bishops among their clergy and in the church, and its response may have influenced the translator’s decision to pair *drohtian* with *don* (against *drohtian 7 lifgan* in [2.7]/[2.7b]) in this one instance. Gregory responds to the three queries of *Interrogation 1* ([2.7]/[2.7b]) in reverse order, dealing first with the behaviour of bishops within the church, then with division of offerings, and finally with the living arrangements of the bishop and his clergy. Accordingly, the response first addresses the concept of *don*—‘to do, perform, act, achieve, make’ (*DOE*)—specified through *drohtian* to indicate action or performance, as in ‘behave’:

[2.10] Sacra scriptura testatur, quam te bene nosse dubium non est, et specialiter beati Pauli ad Timotheum epistulae, in quibus eum erudire studuit, qualiter in domo Dei conuersari debuisset. (CM 80.1-4)<sup>40</sup>

[2.10b] Cwæð he: þæt halige gewrit þæt cyðeð, þæt me nis tweo þæt þu gearwe const, ond synderlice þæs eadgan Paules epistola þone he wrát to Timotheo, in þam he hine geornlice tydde 7 lærde, hu he in Godes huse **drohtian 7 don** scolde. (Miller 64:10-14)<sup>41</sup>

The Latin text of this passage quotes directly from the closing portion of the Biblical letter from Paul to Timothy to which *Interrogation 1* refers, lifting *in domo Dei conuersari* (CM 80:4) directly from 1 Tim. 3:15:

[2.11] <sup>15</sup> si autem tardávero, ut scias quómodo opórteat te in domo Dei conversári, quæ est ecclésia Dei vivi, colúmna et firmaméntum veritátis. (*Vulgata Clementina* 1 Tim. 3:15)<sup>42</sup>

The translator's *drohtian 7 don*, which highlights the concept of behaviour within the sacred space of the church, forms a part of the translation of this biblical phrase. The body of Paul's epistle contains the clearest indications of influences on the translator's decision to pair *drohtian* with *don* in this instance:

[2.12] <sup>1</sup> A FAITHFUL saying: if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. <sup>2</sup> It behoveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, prudent, of good behavior, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher, <sup>3</sup> Not given to wine, no striker, but modest, not quarrelsome, not covetous, but <sup>4</sup> One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all chastity. <sup>5</sup> But if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? <sup>6</sup> Not a neophyte: lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the

---

<sup>40</sup> "The sacred scriptures with which you are doubtless very familiar bear witness to this and especially the epistles of St. Paul to Timothy, in which he took pains to instruct him how he ought to behave himself in the house of God." (CM 81)

<sup>41</sup> He said: The Holy Writ says that, which I doubt not you know well, and especially the letter of blessed Paul that he wrote to Timothy, in which he earnestly taught and instructed him, how he should live and act in God's house.

<sup>42</sup> <sup>15</sup> But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." (Douay-Rheims)

devil. <sup>7</sup> Moreover he must have a good testimony of them who are without: lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. <sup>8</sup> Deacons in like manner chaste, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre: <sup>9</sup> Holding the mystery of faith in a pure conscience. <sup>10</sup> And let these also first be proved: and so let them minister, having no crime. <sup>11</sup> The women in like manner chaste, not slanderers, but sober, faithful in all things. <sup>12</sup> Let deacons be the husbands of one wife: who rule well their children, and their own houses. <sup>13</sup> For they that have ministered well, shall purchase to themselves a good degree, and much confidence in the faith which is in Christ Jesus. (Douay-Rheims, 1 Tim. 3:1-13)

The instruction contained within this letter is addressed throughout the first *Interrogation*, and applies almost exclusively to character and personal behavior within the space and offices of the physical Church. The translator's selection of *don* modifies *drohtian* to specify personal conduct, while his earlier use of *lifgan* as a doubling partner for *drohtian* indicates more the general lifestyle modes, such as dwelling place or form of community, to which bishops should adhere.

This use of *lifgan* to indicate general lifestyle is reinforced later in the response, where it is paired with *drohtian* a second time. The last part of Gregory's response to *Interrogation* 1 addresses living arrangements as opposed to personal behavior:

[2.13] Sed quia tua fraternitas monasterii regulis erudita seorsum fieri non debet a clericis suis in ecclesia Anglorum, quae auctore Deo nuper adhuc ad fidem perducta est, hanc debet conuersionem instituere, quae initio nascentis ecclesiae fuit patribus nostris; in quibus nullus eorum ex his quae possidebant aliquid suum esse dicebat, sed erant eis omnia communia. Siqui uero sunt clerici extra sacros ordines constituti, qui se continere non possunt, sortire uxores debent, et stipendia sua exterius accipere (CM 80.8-16)<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> "But because you, brother, are conversant with monastic rules, and ought not to live apart from your clergy in the English Church, which, by the guidance of God, has lately been converted to the faith, you ought to institute that manner of life which our fathers followed in the earliest beginnings of the Church: none of them said that anything he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common. If, however, there are any who are clerics but in minor orders and who cannot be continent, they should marry and receive their stipends outside the community" (CM 81)



[2.13b] Ac forðon þin broðorlicnes is in mynstres regolum getýd 7 gelæred, ne scealt þu hwæþre sundor beon from þinum geferum in Ongolciran, seo nu gen neowan is becumen 7 gelæded to Godes geleafan. **Þas drohtunge 7 þis liif** þu scealt gesettan, þætte in fruman þære acennendan cirican wæs ussum fædrum, in þæm nænig heora, of þam þe heo ahton, owiht his beon onsundrad cwæð, ac him eallum wæron eall gemæno. Gif þonne hwylce preostas 7 Godes þeowas synd butan halgum hádum gesette, þa ðe heo from wiifum ahabban ne mæge, nimen heom wiif 7 heora ondleofone utan onfongen. (Miller 64:18-21)<sup>44</sup>

Again, the doubling partner for *drohtian* differentiates the two different understandings of *conversor* or *conversatio* evident in the *Interrogation*. *Lifgan* specifies living arrangements and general mode of life, while *dón* indicates conduct or behavior, with an underlying suggestion of ‘example’ transmitted through St. Paul’s letter.

The conduct or behaviour indicated through the translator’s addition of *dón* in *Interrogation* 1 is further explicated in *Interrogation* 2. Essentially, *Interrogation* 2 extends Gregory’s advice on establishing correct modes of observance and administration in *Interrogation* 1. It provides instruction on determining and installing appropriate liturgical customs to be supported by good governance in the new English Church:

[2.14] Cum una sit fides, sunt ecclesiarum diuersae consuetudines, et altera consuetudo missarum in sancta Romana ecclesia atque altera in Galliarum tenetur? (CM 80.28-30)<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> But because your brotherhood is taught and learned in the rule of the monastery, however you shall not be apart from your companions in the English Church, which is now still newly come and lead to the faith of God. You shall establish this manner of living and this life, that was our fathers’ in the beginning of the rising church, in which none of them, of that which they owned, said that anything was his separately, but they all had all in common. If then any priests and servants of God are placed outside the holy brotherhoods, when they may not abstain from women, let them take wives to them and receive their living without.

<sup>45</sup> “Even though the faith is one are there varying customs in the churches? And is there one form of mass in the Holy Roman church and another in the Gaulish churches?” (CM 81)

[2.14b] Mid þy an geleafa is 7 seondon missenlice gewunan ciricena, oðer gewuna is mæssesonga in þære halgan Romaniscan cirican 7 oðer is hæfd in Gallia rice. (Miller 66.15-17)<sup>46</sup>

The issue Augustine raises relates directly to Gregory's response to *Interrogation* 1, in which the habits of 'good, religious life' are described:

[2.15] De eorum quoque stipendio cogitandum atque prouidendum est, et sub ecclesiastica regula sunt tenendi, ut bonis **moribus** uiuant et canendis psalmis inuigilent, et ab omnibus illicitis et cor et linguam et corpus Deo auctore conseruent (CM 80.18-22)<sup>47</sup>

[2.15b] Swylce eac be heora ondlifne is to þencenne 7 to foreseonne, þæt heo godum **þeawum** lifgen under ciriclecum regole 7 sealmas to singenne 7 wæccan to bigongenne, 7 from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden. (Miller 66.3-7)<sup>48</sup>

The translator's revision of the passage from *Interrogation* 1 above reverses the Latin's ordering of *sub ecclesiastica regula sunt tenendi* ('they are to be kept under ecclesiastical rule') and *bonis moribus uiuant* ('they live with good customs/morals') so that *bonis moribus uiuant* (or *he godum þeawum lifgen*) governs the remaining clauses. As such the reader perceives *ciriclecum regole* ('church rule'), *sealmas to singenne* ('singing psalms'), *wæccan to bigongenne* ('waking to worship'), and maintaining purity (*from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden*) to be part of living *godum þeawum*, bringing this concept of good 'customs, usages, or general practices' (Bosworth & Toller) to the centre of Gregory's prescription.

---

<sup>46</sup> When there is one faith and there are various customs of the churches, there is one form of mass in the Holy Roman church and another is held in the kingdom of the Gauls.

<sup>47</sup> Care must also be taken and provision made for their stipends and they must be kept under ecclesiastical rule, living a moral life and staying awake for singing of psalms, and keeping body and tongue and heart from all things unlawful under the authority of God.

<sup>48</sup> Likewise also about their living is to be considered and to be reasoned, so that they live in good customs under Church rule and sing psalms and wake to worship, and from all things unlawful hold their hearts and tongues and bodies clean for God almighty.

To address the issues raised in the question of *Interrogation 2*, Augustine is provided with instructions as to how to establish the customs around which a life *godum þeawum* should be constructed. These instructions are summarised at the closing of the *Interrogation*:

[2.16] Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere. (CM 82.4-6)<sup>49</sup>

[2.16b] Forþon of syndrigum ciricum gehwylcum þa ðu æfest 7 good 7 riht geceose, þa ðu togædre gesomna, 7 on Ongolþeode mod in gewunan aset. (Miller 66.25-27)<sup>50</sup>

The translator's version of the response to *Interrogation 2* reinforces the connection between these two *Interrogations* through particular vocabulary choices. The first of these choices replaces the Latin's *consuetudinem*:<sup>51</sup>

[2.17] Nouit fraternitas tua Romanae ecclesiae **consuetudinem**, in qua se meminit nutritam. (CM 80.31-2)<sup>52</sup>

[2.17b] Ðu seolfa const **þeaw 7 gewunan** þære Romaniscan cirican in þære þu afeded wære. (Miller 66.18-19)<sup>53</sup>

*þeaw 7 gewunan* (*consuetudinem* CM 80.32; Miller 66.18) employs two words very similar in sense to function emphatically, and may have been formed with repetition and rhythm rather than semantics in mind. The use of *þeaw* in this doubling, however, echoes the translator's earlier use of the noun in *Interrogation 1* ([2.15]/[2.15b]), recalling the context of that earlier usage. In extract 2.15/2.15b, the

<sup>49</sup> "Therefore choose from every individual Church whatever things are devout, religious, and right. And when you have collected these as it were into one bundle, see that the minds of the English grow accustomed to it." (CM 83)

<sup>50</sup> Thus from individual churches whatever you choose that is pious and good and right, gather you that together, and in the minds of the English establish as custom.

<sup>51</sup> The translation replaces *consuetudo* sixteen times, nine of which occur in the *Libellus*, rendering it consistently with (*ge-*)*wuna* alone (i.e. without a doubling partner) in all instances but this one.

<sup>52</sup> "My brother, you know the customs of the Roman Church in which, of course, you were brought up." (CM 81)

<sup>53</sup> You yourself know the habits and customs of the Roman Church in which you were nourished.

translator replaces the Latin text's *mos* with *þeáw*. This replacement is common, but develops in interest alongside the translator's choice to pair *þeáw* with his habitual replacement for *consuetudo* at the opening of the response to *Interrogation 2* ([2.17]/[2.17b]). *þeáw* recalls the *þeáwas* outlined in *Interrogation 1* as the foundation for Christian life 'with good customs', to include the new (*ge-*) *wunan* listed in *Interrogation 2*, specifically *mæssesonga*, among these rituals. This connection also encourages the 'customs' required under a life *godum þeawum* in *Interrogation 1* to be included among the customs for which the 'most pleasing to God' is to be chosen from among the usages of the various established Churches in *Interrogation 2*.

Like the 'good customs' cited as part of ideal Christian lifestyle in *Interrogation 1*, the Christian behaviour outlined in the other *Interrogations* is to be instituted and maintained through executive positions within the Church. Augustine occupies the most prominent of these positions, as the recipient of the recommendations provided by Gregory in the *Libellus* and as England's archbishop. Within the *Libellus*, however, Gregory also draws attention to others in similar positions, and to how such authorities should interact to institute and maintain the most appropriate behavioural 'rules'. These positions of authority also capture the translator's attention. In *Interrogation 7*, concerning the relationship between Church officers of Britain with those of Gaul, the translator manipulates the location of personal authority communicated in the Latin version by adding and subtracting from the text for his translation. Gregory's initial comment denying Augustine any authority over Gallic bishops is retained:

[2.18] Ipse autem extra **auctoritatem** propriam episcopos Galliarum iudicare non poteris; sed suadendo, blandiendo, bona quoque opera eorum imitationi monstrando prauorum mentes ad sanctitatis studia reforma (CM 88.3-6)<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> "You have no right to judge the bishops of Gaul, who are outside your jurisdiction; but, by persuading and winning them and by showing them a good example to imitate, you may restore the minds of the depraved to a zeal for holiness." (CM 89)

[2.18b] Ne meaht þu deman Gallia biscopas buton heora agenre  
**aldorlicnesse**, ac þu hy á scealt liðelice monigan 7 him æteawan þinra godra  
 weorca onhyrenesse. (Miller 74.5-7)<sup>55</sup>

However, the translator removes Gregory's explication of this ruling (an invocation of Dueteronomy 23:25), in which the Bishop of Arles becomes trustee of the harvest:

[2.19] ..., quia scriptum est in lege: 'Per alienam messem transiens falcem mittere non debet, sed manu spicas conterere et manducare.' Falcem enim iudicii mittere non potes in ea segete, quae alteri uidetur esse commissa, sed per affectum boni operis frumenta dominica uitiorum suorum paleis expolia, et in ecclesiae corpore monendo et persuadendo quasi mandendo conuerte. (CM 88.6-12)<sup>56</sup>

The passer-by, Augustine, is permitted to metaphorically eat or process the standing harvest of the bishops of Gaul, through 'persuasion and warning' (*persuadendo quasi mandendo* CM 88.11-12) and by allowing his good example to 'rub off' on them. The translator's excision of this explicatory passage removes several developments in meaning. The individual authority and capability attributed to the Bishop of Arles himself, through his characterisation as the trustee of the harvest, for example, is lost in the later part of the OE version of the response. The reader of the OE version must then take indications of distribution of authority from elsewhere.

Initially, the translator emphasises maintenance of the authority of the Bishop of Arles through additions in two doublings:

[2.20] In Galliarum episcopis nullam tibi auctoritatem tribuimus, quia ab antiquis prodecessorum meorum temporibus pallium Arelatensis episcopus accepit, quem nos **priuare** auctoritate percepta minime debemus. Si igitur contingat ut fraternitas tua ad Galliarum prouinciam transeat, cum eodem

---

<sup>55</sup> You may not judge the Gallic bishops without their own authority, but you shall always gently warn them and show them the example of your good works.

<sup>56</sup> "It is written in the Law: 'When you pass through the standing corn of another, you shall not put a sickle into it: but you may rub the ears with your hands and eat.' You cannot put the sickle of judgement into that harvest which you see has been entrusted to another: but by the influence of good works you may clear the Lord's wheat from the chaff of its vices and by warning and persuasion transform it into the Church's body as though by eating it." (CM 89)

Arelatense episcopo debet **agere** qualiter, siqua sunt in episcopis uitia, corrigantur.(CM 86.30-36)<sup>57</sup>

[2.20b] In Gallia biscopum ne sellað we þe ænge aldorlicnesse, forðon þe fram þam ærran tidum minra foregengena pallium onfeng se biscop in Areéla þære byrig, þone we ne sculon **bescerian ne beneoman** þære onfongan aldorlicnesse. Ac gif þe foor gelimpe in Gallia mægðe, hafa ðu mid þone ilcan biscop **sprece 7 geþeahte** hwæt to donne sy, oðþo gif hwelc uncyst in biscopum gemette syn, hu þa gerehte 7 gebette beon scylen. (Miller 72.21-3)<sup>58</sup>

The additional negative contained in the doubling construction *bescerian ne beneoman* emphasises Gregory's support and protection of the Bishop of Arles' position, while Gregory's instruction to collaborate with Arles concerning correction of faulty behaviour among bishops is enhanced through the emphasis on thought and wisdom effected by *sprece 7 geþeahte*. Along with these initial impressions, however, both these doublings add significantly to the sense of the OE version of the *Interrogation*, and to its relationship with its wider contexts of previous *Interrogations* and the *HE* as a whole.

*Privare* receives seven translations into the OE version of the *HE*. One of these is a discountable paraphrase:

---

<sup>57</sup> "We give you no authority over the bishops of Gaul because the bishop of Arles received the pallium long ago in the days of my predecessors and we must on no account deprive him of the authority he has received. So, my brother, if you chance to cross over to the province of Gaul, you must consult with the bishop of Arles as to how such faults as are found among the bishops may be amended. If he should happen to be slack in his discipline he must be kindled by your zeal." (CM 87)

<sup>58</sup> Among the Gallic bishops we do not give you any authority, because from the early time of my predecessors the bishop in the city of Arles has received the pallium, whom we should not deprive nor bereave of the authority he received. But if you happen through the Gallic nation, have conversation and consideration with that same bishop as to what is to be done, or if some error is found in the bishops, how that should be corrected and improved. And if it is expected, that his strength of discipline and castigation is too tepid, then he is to be incited and to be improved with your brotherly love, so that he prohibit those things which are contrary to the command and instruction of our creator from the habits of bishops.

[2.21] ..., adlatus est quidam de genere Anglorum **oculorum luce priuatus**.  
(CM 136.14)<sup>59</sup>

[2.21b] ..., þa lædde mon forð sumne **blinde** mon of Ongolcynne. (Miller 100.3)<sup>60</sup>

Otherwise, the translator associates *privare* with *be-scerian* alone in three out of the six remaining occurrences, all of which are found within the *Libellus* text and share a context of exclusion from church ritual. In two of the remaining three occurrences, *beneoman* replaces *privare*. Again, these uses share elements of context, both referring to deprivation of royal office:

[2.22] ..., sperans se regem Eduinum regno simul et uita **priuaturum**; ...  
(CM 164.16-17)<sup>61</sup>

[2.22b] þæt he scolde Eadwine þone cyninge somed ge rice ge lif  
**beneoman**. (Miller 122.10-11)<sup>62</sup>

[2.23] ...; ideoque bello petitus ac regno **priuatus** ab illo, ... (CM 234.1-2)<sup>63</sup>

[2.23b] þa teah Penda hine fyrð on 7 here, 7 hine his rices **benom**. (Miller 168.20)<sup>64</sup>

The doubling *bescerian ne beneoman* in *Interrogation 7* combines the senses of both these replacements for *privare*, incorporating the association between *be-scerian* and Church ritual, established in *Interrogation 5* and perpetuated here and in *Interrogation 8*, and the connection between *be-niman* and secular rulership developed in the extracts above. This overlap in sense between the worldly and the religious ‘body politic’ is repeated in other uses of *be-niman* alone, associated with loss of either a diocese (or bishopric) or use of bodily limbs (*condemnare* 462.1; *deponere* 280.24; *destituere* 390.12). The combination is also repeated in a replication

---

<sup>59</sup> “... a man of the English race was brought forth who was blind.” (CM 137)

<sup>60</sup> Then they brought forth a certain blind man of the English.

<sup>61</sup> “... hoping to deprive King Edwin of his kingdom and his life.” (CM 165)

<sup>62</sup> So that he should deprive Edwin the King of his kingdom and his life at the same time.

<sup>63</sup> “... for this he was attacked by Penda and deprived of his kingdom, ...” (CM 235)

<sup>64</sup> Then Penda led his army and host against him, and deprived him of his kingdom.

of *bescerian ne beneoman*, applied to use of limbs in V:IV, impressing the sense of disability associated with deprivation:

[2.24] ..., ita ut, **deficiente** penitus omni membrorum officio, iamiamque moriturus esse uideretur; ... (CM 464.4-5)<sup>65</sup>

[2.24b] ..., swa þæt he wæs loma 7 ealra his lioma þegnunga **benumen 7 bescired**, ... (Miller 396.18-19)<sup>66</sup>

The association between *beniman* and the body, alongside the tactile, material suggestion in *bescerian* ('cut'), typically used to describe exclusion from sacred space and community, bring a sense of bodily and spatial physicality to *Interrogation 7*'s *bescerian ne beneoman*. The 'authority' Gregory wishes preserved for the bishop of Arles in *Interrogation 7* is thus invested with two distinct but overlapping senses of authority. The power of such a church official within *Interrogation 7* involves, first, the religious or spiritual authority to perform church ritual, and second the active control involved in governmental authority over a body of population or land associated with holding a bishopric or 'ruling' as a king or 'head'.

### *Gregory's Consideratio: Thought and Judgement*

In addition to these active components, 'authority' in the translator's *Interrogation 7* is accompanied by a sense of deliberation, expressed through a doubled replacement for *debet agere* (CM 86.35), *hafa ðu ... sprece 7 geþeahhte* (Miller 72.25).

[2.25] Si igitur contingat ut fraternitas tua ad Galliarum prouinciam transeat, cum eodem Arelatense episcopo **debet agere** qualiter, siqua sunt in episcopis uitia, corrigantur. (CM 86.33-36)<sup>67</sup>

[2.25b] Ac gif þe for gelimpe in Gallia mægðe, **hafa ðu** mid þone ilcan biscop **sprece 7 geþeahhte** hwæt to donne sy, oðþo gif hwelc uncyst in

---

<sup>65</sup> " ... so that he had lost all the use of his limbs and seemed to be at the point of death." (CM 465)

<sup>66</sup> So that he was lame and cut off and deprived from the use of all his limbs.

<sup>67</sup> "So, my brother, if you chance to cross over to the province of Gaul, you must consult with the bishop of Arles as to how such faults as are found among the bishops may be amended." (CM 87)



biscopum gemette syn, hu þa gerehte 7 gebette beon scylen. (Miller 72.24-74.1)<sup>68</sup>

The infinitive form of *ago* used here is most frequently replaced with *don* elsewhere in the translation:

---

<sup>68</sup> But if you happen through the Gallic nation, have conversation and consideration with that same bishop as to what is to be done, or if some error is found in the bishops, how that should be corrected and improved.

TABLE 1: *Translated occurrences of agere (infinitive form)*<sup>69</sup>

Headword	Location (CM/Plummer)		Translation & Location	
agere	1:1	[18.13/12.5]	don	[28.13]
	1:27	[78.20/48.18]	don	[64.9]
	1:27	[86.29/52.99]	don	[72.20]
	1:27	[86.35/53.3]	sprece 7 geþeahte	[72.25]
	2:9	[164.32/99.22]	don	[122.30]
	2:12	[176.29/108.3]	don	[126.33]
	3:19	[270.17/164.23]	to donne	[210.31]
	4:5	[352.1/216.21]	don	[278.22]
	4:23	[412.1/256.19]	don	[338.16]
	5:19	[518.8/323.4]	(discere et agere) leornian 7 don	[450.30]
	5:19	[520.8/324.15]	(coepisse agere) ongunne	[354.15]
	5:22	[554.3/347.3]	heoldan 7 dydon	[472.13]

Here, however, the translator replaces the main verb phrase, *debet agere*, with *hafa ðu sprece 7 geþeahte* (Waite 210). The translator's rephrased rendering of this sentence emphasises the implied imperative in *debet* (*hafa ðu*), and departs from the translator's usual treatment of *agere* to express a sense of consideration through *sprece 7 geþeahte*. This vocabulary choice draws out the sense of 'discussion' inherent in *agere* (Lewis & Short 75) through a doubling used elsewhere to replace *consilio* (*gesprec 7 geþeaht* Miller 134.7; *spræce 7 geþeahte* Miller 248.4-5). The translator's

<sup>69</sup> Only occurrences of the infinitive form of *ago*—*agere*—that are directly translated into the OE version are listed here. A further three occurrences appear in chapters excised from the translation (II:XI, III:XXIV, IV:XIV), two occur in passages which are edited out of the translation or altered in sense (I:XIV [48.6/29.27], II:I [130.24/72.21]), and a final two are absorbed into the sense of the sentence as a whole without direct translation in a similar way to *agere/ongunne* above. Other forms of *ago* can be found eight more times within the *Libellus*, but have otherwise not been analysed in depth due to their quantity.

version of Gregory's instruction thus advises Augustine not merely to act<sup>70</sup> with the Bishop of Arles to correct faults among the bishops, but to "have discourse and deliberation" with him.

The translator's emphasis on deliberation and co-operation as part of a position of authority, enacted particularly in *Interrogation 7*'s treatment of *agere* (*sprece 7 geþeahhte*), reflects a 'voice' other than that of Bede with which the translator must negotiate—that of the author of the *Libellus*, Gregory. Doublings chosen by the translator to represent single word expressions of key ideas within the *Libellus* frequently amend the text to emphasise Gregory's voice. Particularly, many of the doublings of this kind found in the *Libellus* highlight the concept of balanced judgement and consideration—or *consideratio*—key to Gregorian thought (Evans 19). This *consideratio* involves a balancing between "the demands of the spiritual life" and "the pressures of life in the world" (Evans 19). For Gregory personally, the concept of *consideratio* as a 'mental exercise' must have had particular resonance in his attempt to balance a desire for a life of contemplation with the requirements of his office:

In *consideratio* he tries to keep the distractions which unavoidably surround him in their place, to manage his life to that higher end he will one day reach. (Evans 21)

The concept is equally applicable to the efforts of Church officers and lay Christians, however, as they attempt to balance the demands and desires of everyday life with those of religious observance.

The text of the *Libellus* provides the translator with a natural location for amplification of the idea of *consideratio*, and for reiteration of examples of *consideratio* within the narrative of the *HE*. Beginning in *Interrogation 1*, the

---

<sup>70</sup> Although *ago* has many senses, this one—to act, or "to pursue, do, perform, transact"—is "the most usual signif. of this word; in all periods; syn. *facere, efficere, transigere, gerere, tractare, curare*" (Lewis and Short 75). The translator's tendency to replace *ago* with *don* suggests that this was also his understanding of the meaning of *ago*.

translator begins a pattern of doublings which demonstrate a partiality to Gregorian moralising rhetoric, by emphasising *consideratio* in relation to concepts fundamental to the wider narrative. The first of these doublings, *becumen 7 gelæded* (Miller 64:21) replacing *perducta* (CM 80:11), occurs only once in the translation, and employs two words of similar sense to express the concept of conversion:

[2.26] ... ne scealt þu hwæþre sundor beon from þinum geferum in  
Ongolciran, seo nu gen neowan is **becumen 7 gelæded** to Godes geleafan.  
(Miller 64:19-21)<sup>71</sup>

In this case the translator's choice of words to pair seems carefully considered, each carrying a different implication. The translator forms this doubling by pairing a habitual translation of the original Latin word, *perducta*—*gelæded*—with a semantic extension.<sup>72</sup> While both *perducta* and *gelæded* imply outside influence, in the sense of *being* led or guided by another, *becuman* (used throughout the translation to render *venire* and its relatives) introduces an impression of autonomous movement and agency on behalf of the mover to counter the passivity inherent in the translator's habitual replacement for *perducere*.

In the wider context of conversion in which this doubling occurs, the concept of volition introduced through *becuman* is emphasised at key points throughout the *HE*. Most prominently, a requirement for valid conversion and faith to be voluntary is a particular feature of Bede's ongoing exploration of ideal Christian kingship in Books One and Two. Bede centres his depiction of conversion in the kingdoms of key models of kingship, Æðelberht in Book I and Edwin in Book II, around the careful consideration each of these kings applies to their own

---

<sup>71</sup> ... however you shall not be apart from your companions in the English Church, which is now still newly arrived and lead to the faith of God.

<sup>72</sup> *Perducere* is translated nineteen times in the Old English *HE*. Almost eighty percent of these replacements employ (ge-) *lædan* as the sole representative of *perducere*, and two instances include (ge-) *lædan* in a doubling - once with *teón* (Miller 448:3), and here, with *becuman*. Only three translations not involving *lædan* are employed, for a single usage each: *gecerde* (Miller 420:18); *geworht* (Miller 176:6); and the phrase *his latteow beon*, "be his guide" (Miller 254:23).

conversion and that of their people. Æðelberht particularly demonstrates an awareness of the importance of choice, considering Augustine's mission carefully himself:

[2.27] 'Pulcra sunt quidem uerba et promissa quae adfertis; sed quia noua sunt et incerta, non his possum ad sensum tribuere relictis eis, quae tanto tempore cum omni Anglorum gente seruauimus. ...' (CM 74:15-18)<sup>73</sup>

And not enforcing Christianity after his own conversion:

[2.28] Quorum fidei et conuersioni ita congratulatus esse rex perhibetur, ut nullum tamen cogeret ad Christianismum, sed tantummodo credentes artiori dilectione, quasi conciuēs sibi regni caelestis, amplecteretur. Didicerat enim a doctoribus auctoribusque suae salutis seruitium Christi uoluntarium, non coacticum esse debere. (CM 76.25-78.4)<sup>74</sup>

Edwin gives conversion similar consideration when he encounters Christian missionary activity in Book II:

[2.29] ... non statim et inconsulte sacramenta fidei Christianae percipere uoluit, quamuis nec idolis ultra seruiuit, ex quo se Christo seruiturum esse promiserat; uerum primo diligentius ex tempore et ab ipso uenerabili uiro Paulino rationem fidei ediscere et cum suis primatibus, quos sapientiores nouerat, curauit conferre, quid de his agendum arbitrarentur. Sed et ipse, cum esset uir natura sagacissimus, saepe diu solus residens ore quidem

---

<sup>73</sup> "The words and promises you bring are fair enough, but because they are new to us and doubtful, I cannot consent to accept them and forsake those beliefs which I and the whole English race have held for so long. ..." (CM 74:15-18)

<sup>74</sup> "It is related that the king, although he rejoiced at their conversion and their faith, compelled no one to accept Christianity; though none the less he showed greater affection for believers since they were his fellow citizens in the kingdom of heaven. But he had learned from his teachers and guides in the way of salvation that the service of Christ was voluntary and ought not to be compulsory." (CM 76-9)

tacito sed in intimis cordis multa secum conloquens, quid sibi esset  
faciendum, quae religio seruanda, tractabat. (CM 166.11-19)<sup>75</sup>

The translator frequently amends Bede's text to strengthen the presence of these ideal attitudes. His translation of [2.28] above, for example, extends Bede's image of the *credentes* ('believers') to *ða ðe to geleafan 7 to fulwihthe cerdon* ('those who turned to the faith and to baptism'). He emphasises the process of conversion and thereby strengthens the relationship between this process and its surrounding ideal:

[2.28b] *Para geleafan 7 gehwyrfednesse is sægd þæt se cyning swa wære efnblissende, þæt he nænne hwæðore nydde to Cristes geleafan, ac ða ðe to geleafan 7 to fulwihthe cerdon, þæt he þa inwordlicor lufode, swa swa hy wæron him efnceasterwaran þæs heofonlican rices. Forðon he geleornode from his lareowum 7 fram þam ordfruman his hælo, þætte Cristes þeowdom sceolde beon wilsumlic, nales geneðedlic.* (Miller 62:16-23)<sup>76</sup>

The translator's extension of Bede's *perducta* through *becuman*, adding a suggestion of autonomous movement and choice to the conversion of the English in this first *Interrogation*, is consistent with the ideal attitudes towards conversion Bede presents in these two central conversion narratives.

As the translator moves on through *Interrogation 2*, he is confronted with a subsequent stage of Christianisation—the establishment of Christian ritual.

'Considered selection' is the key concept behind Gregory's response to this *Interrogation*, and its application is highlighted in the translator's version through

---

<sup>75</sup> "he was unwilling to accept the mysteries of the Christian faith at once and without consideration, even though he no longer worshipped idols after he had promised that he would serve Christ. But first he made it his business, as opportunity occurred, to learn the faith systematically from the venerable Bishop Paulinus, and then to consult with the counsellors whom he considered the wisest, as to what they thought he should do. He himself being a man of great natural sagacity would often sit alone for long periods in silence, but in his innermost thoughts he was deliberating with himself as to what he ought to do and what religion he should adhere to." (CM 167)

<sup>76</sup> In their faith and conversion the king is said to have rejoiced, however that he forced no-one to Christ's faith, but those who turned to the faith and to baptism, he loved deeply, as they were fellow citizens of the heavenly kingdom with him. Because he learned from his teachers and from the creators of his salvation, that Christ's service should be voluntary and not at all compulsory.

the addition of a doubling partner for the Latin's *placet* (CM 80.33). *Me þynceð 7 bet licað* (Miller 66.19) makes a semantic emendation to the Latin's *mihi placet* (CM 80.33):

[2.30] Sed **mihi placet** ut, siue in Romana siue in Galliarum seu in qualibet ecclesia aliquid inuenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum ecclesia, quae adhuc ad fidem noua est, institutione praecipua, quae de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti infundas. (CM 80.32-82.3)<sup>77</sup>

[2.30b] Ac **me nu þynceð 7 bet licað**, þætte swa hwæt swa þu oðþo in Romana cirican oðþo in Gallia oðþo in hwylcre oðerre hwæt þæs gemætte, þætte ælmeahtegum Gode ma licie, þæt þu bihygdlice þæt geceose ond in Ongolðeode cirican fæstlice to healdenne gesette, seo nu gena is neowu in geleafan. (Miller 66.19-23)<sup>78</sup>

The second element of this doubling, (*ge-*) *lican*, replaces *placere* in fourteen out of seventeen translated instances, and is thus a consistent, habitual replacement. Of the three remaining replacements for *placeo* found in the translation, two are doublings or larger expansions containing (*ge-*) *lican* (*þæt licede 7 leof wære, gif hit his willa wære: placuisse* CM 442.25, Miller 374.26), of which *me þynceð 7 bet licað* here is one, and one employs *puhte* alone (*placuitque* CM 238.37; Miller 174.25). While *me bet licað* —‘it pleases me better’—communicates an unqualified preference, the addition of *þyncan* (*me þynceð*—‘it seems to me’, or ‘I think’) implies conscious assessment of the situation and options at hand.

Careful thought and consideration form an integral part of portrayals of Gregory and his style of governance, in his own correspondence and works as well as

---

<sup>77</sup> “But it is my wish that if you have found any customs in the Roman or the Gaulish Church or any other church which may be more pleasing to almighty God, you should make careful selection of them and sedulously teach the Church of the English, which is still new in the faith, what you have been able to gather from other churches.” (CM 81,83)

<sup>78</sup> But I now think and like better, that whatever you find either in the Roman church or that of the Gauls or in whichever other, that pleases almighty God more, that you carefully choose that and establish it to be firmly held in the church of the English people, which is now still new in the faith.

in the *Libellus* and the *HE*, where they are put forward as behavioural models for the reader. In an examination of the theme of “diversity within unity” evident in Gregory’s reply to *Interrogation 2*, Paul Meyvaert noted distinct similarities between the attitude advocated in the Latin version of the reply and that evident in Gregory’s other writings (Meyvaert 146). The Latin text of *Interrogation 2* shows limited preference for any particular church, but rather advises customs from each be chosen according to *quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere* and what is most suited to the new Church in England, *quae adhuc ad fidem nova est*. The customs of each distinct church are to be considered on their individual merits, and the selected customs to be combined into a functional, autonomous church which is yet still part of and in communication with the ‘universal’ church:

[2.16] Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem depone. (CM 82. 4-6)<sup>79</sup>

This advice echoes passages in Gregory’s *Moralia in Job* and *In Ezechiel*:

Si autem unum quid cuncti agerent, corpus utique quod ex multis continetur, non esset: quia videlicet multipliciter compactum non existeret, si hoc concors membrorum diversitas non teneret. (*Moralia* XXVIII, 23 (PL 76, 462))<sup>80</sup>

‘In domo patris mei mansiones multae sunt’ (Jn 14.2). Sed in eisdem multis mansionibus erit aliquomodo ipsa retributionum diversitas concors ... (*Moralia* IV 70 (PL 75, 677))<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> “Therefore choose from every individual Church whatever things are devout, religious, and right. And when you have collected these as it were into one bundle, see that the minds of the English grow accustomed to it.” (CM 83)

<sup>80</sup> But were they all to do the same thing they would certainly not be a body which is composed of many members; since, of course, it would not be composed of many parts if the harmonious diversity of members did not bind it all together. (Meyvaert 153)

<sup>81</sup> ‘In my father’s house there are many mansions’: but in those many mansions the diversity of rewards will be somehow in harmony. (Meyvaert 153)



... si una quaelibet regio alterius regionis fructibus non indigeret,  
communione cum altera non habuisset. (*In Ezechiel* I.10. 34 (*PL* 76,  
900))<sup>82</sup>

Gregory's personal correspondence also contains multiple passages giving similar advice (Meyvaert 158).<sup>83</sup> In his advice to Augustine on how to select customs for the new English Church, Gregory advocates choosing discriminately from a diverse range, to assemble a unified body of traditions which suits the unique requirements of a particular, individual, Church.

A further passage from *Moralia*, on 'teaching', stresses this need for considered discrimination—an important principle of selection—according to particular requirements:

Pro qualitate audientium formari debet sermo doctorum, ut et sua singulis  
congruat et tamen a communis aedificationis arte namquam recedat.  
(*Moralia* XXX. 12 (*PL* 76, 530))<sup>84</sup>

*Regula Pastoralis*, which was translated by Alfred and (according to Discenza) had a deep influence on his "vision of what Anglo-Saxon society *was*" (67), also promotes tailored consideration as part of selection processes. In particular, Gregory dedicates part III of the work, titled *Qualiter rector bene vivens debeat docere et admonere subditos*,<sup>85</sup> to recommendations for governance and discipline according to circumstances. Chapter One of this 'part' encapsulates the spirit of part III's forty chapters. It provides a list of 'diversities' to be considered when selecting disciplinary measures, such as *aliter inopes*, *aliter locupletes*,<sup>86</sup> which forms the core of Gregory's recommendations throughout part III (*Regula Pastoralis* III. 1-32 (*PL* 77, 50-121)).

---

<sup>82</sup> ... he could have granted to each region all varieties of gifts; but if each region had not needed the produce of the other regions, there would have been no intercourse between them. (Meyvaert 153-4)

<sup>83</sup> Gregory's emphasis on communication and co-operation between members of the greater 'body' of the church is recognised particularly by the translator in his version of *Interrogations* 6 and 7.

<sup>84</sup> The discourse of teachers should be adapted to the quality of their hearers so that it may both suit the needs of each particular one and yet not fail to build all together into one body. (Meyvaert 148)

<sup>85</sup> How a good ruler ought to live and admonish those placed under him.

<sup>86</sup> In one way the poor, in another the rich.

Within the *Libellus* itself, Gregory frequently instructs reflection on individual circumstances in decision making and selection. In *Interrogation 1*, for instance, Gregory invokes Acts. 4:35 to recommend that Church stipends should be shared out according to individual requirements:

[2.31] ... quia et de hisdem patribus, de quibus praefati sumus, nouimus scriptum, quod diuidebatur singulis, prout cuique opus erat. (CM 80.16-18)<sup>87</sup>

Such recommendation of consideration according to circumstances is repeated in *Interrogation 2*, with its advice to ‘choose with anxious care’ (*sollicite eligas* CM 82.1) which customs to institute in the new English Church. The translator picks up on this requirement for consideration according to the individual needs of the English church ‘*quae adhuc ad fidem nova est*’ in his insertion of *nu* (‘now’) in association with the doubling *þynceð 7 bet licað*:

[2.32] Sed mihi placet ut

[2.32b] Ac me **nu** þynceð 7 bet licað

*Nu* here creates a sense of immediacy and ‘tailored’ deliberation, suggesting assessment according to a particular time and situation.

In *Interrogation 3*, concerning theft from Churches, ‘selection’ governed by ‘love’ forms the focus of Gregory’s response, which opens with a reiteration of the ‘tailored selection’ advised in *Interrogation 2*:

[2.33] Hoc tua fraternitas ex persona furis **pensare** potest, qualiter ualeat corrigi. (CM 82.9-10)<sup>88</sup>

[2.33b] Ðis mæg **geþencan** þin broðorlicnes of þæs þeofes hade, hu he geriht beon mægge. (Miller 68.1-2)<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> “for we know that it is written concerning those fathers whom we have mentioned that division was to be made to each according to his need.” (CM 81)

<sup>88</sup> “My brother, you must judge from the thief’s circumstances what punishment he ought to have.” (CM 83)

<sup>89</sup> Your brotherhood may consider this from the condition of the thief, how he should be corrected.

This initial advice places Augustine in the position of ‘judge’ once again, this time encouraging him to assemble modes of correction selectively, tailoring a solution to each situation as it arises, because, as Gregory argues, “there are some who commit theft though they have resources, while others transgress in this matter through poverty” (CM 83). This idea of the considerate ‘judge’ recalls the exploration of diversity contained in part III of Gregory’s *Regula Pastoralis*, and is reinforced in the translation later, as the translator forms a doubling to translate *dictat*:

[2.34] Haec ergo caritas in mente tenenda est, et ipsa modum correctionis **dictat**, ita ut mens extra rationis regulam omnino nihil faciat. (CM 82.20–22)<sup>90</sup>

[2.34b] Forðon seo lufu is á in þæm moode to haldanne, 7 hit þæt gemet þara þrea **dihtað 7 findeð**, swa ðætte þæt mód buton rihtum regole allinga nowiht deð. (Miller 68.15–17)<sup>91</sup>

The translator follows the word order of the Latin text in a gloss-like fashion throughout this passage, particularly in the final clause (*swa ðætte - deð*), drawing attention to deviations. To form the doubling *dihtað 7 findeð*, the translator extends the sense of the Latin source word, *dictare*, for its sole translated instance in the *HE*. The resultant doubling pairs *dihtan*, a loan-word from *dictare*, with an additional concept, expressed through *findan*. Like the addition of *þyncan* to form the doubling replacing *placet* in *Interrogation 2* (CM 80.33; Miller 66.19), *findan* adds an impression of conscious assessment, reiterating the recurring emphasis on pensive decision making prevalent in previous *Interrogations* and conversion narratives.

Each of the above expressions promoting *consideratio* through ‘balanced judgement’ is associated with a context of individual authority, whether a king considering conversion or Augustine himself, making decisions based on analysis of the needs of others. *Interrogations 1* and *2* advise Augustine on the Christian

---

<sup>90</sup> “So we must always keep love in mind and love must dictate the method of correction, so that we do not decide on anything unreasonable.” (CM 83)

<sup>91</sup> Because love is always to be held in the spirit, and it dictates and finds that measure of discipline, so that the mind does nothing at all without correct governance.

lifestyle he should choose and institute for the new English faithful, while in *Interrogation* 3 he is required to pass judgement and mete out punishment on a thief. In *Interrogations* 8 and 9, however, the characterisation of *consideratio* turns inwards, to encompass self-judgement and introspective contemplation.

Both *Interrogation* 8 and *Interrogation* 9 confront the issue of reconciliation between religious observance and the most worldly of considerations—sexuality and reproduction. Although Gregory reiterates several strict prohibitions over the course of *Interrogation* 8, he is also careful to advise (and argue for) self-judgement concerning particular issues. When advising on whether or not a woman may enter the sacred space of a Church and receive Communion during menstruation, for example, Gregory pointedly refers this decision to the woman herself:

[2.35] Atque ideo feminae cum semet ipsis **considerent**, et si in menstrua consuetudine ad sacramentum dominici corporis et sanguinis accedere, non praesumant, de sua recta consideratione laudandae sunt; ... (CM 92.36–94.3)<sup>92</sup>

Likewise, a man is to decide for himself if he may receive Communion after intercourse for the purposes of procreation:

[2.36] Siquis uero suam coniugem non cupidine uoluptatis raptus sed solummodo creandorum liberorum gratia utitur, iste profecto siue de ingressu ecclesiae seu de sumendo dominici corporis sanguinisque mysterio **suo est iudicio relinquendus**, quia a nobis prohiberi non debet accipere, qui in igne positus nescit ardere. (CM 96.22–26)<sup>93</sup>

[2.36b] Swa hwelc mon swa his wiif, nales for unrehtæs willan willunge, ac for intingan anum bruceð to streonne, þes mon is **his seolfes dome to forlættenne**, oððe be cirican ingonge, oððe to onfonne þam geryne Cristes lichoman 7 his blode; forþon we him ne sculon biwerigan þam halgan

---

<sup>92</sup> “Let women make up their own minds and if they do not venture to approach the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord when in their periods, they are to be praised for their right thinking...” (CM 95)

<sup>93</sup> “So if anyone approaches his wife, not carried away by lustful desire but only for the sake of getting children, such a man is by all means to be left to his own judgement both in the matter of entering the church and of receiving the mystery of the Lord’s Body and Blood; for one who is placed in the fire and yet cannot burn ought not to be hindered by us from receiving.” (CM 97)

geryne onfon, se ðe in fyre geseted bið 7 beornan ne conn. (Miller 82.19-25)<sup>94</sup>

In *Interrogation* 9, the gravity of sin involved in a ‘wet dream’ is to be determined by the mind of the culprit, which is to sit “in judgement on itself” (CM 101):

[2.37] ...; quia et primam culpam serpens suggesit, Eua uelut caro delectata est, Adam uero uelut spiritus consensit; et necessaria est magna discretio, ut inter suggestionem atque delectationem, inter delectationem et consensum iudex **sui animus praesideat**. (CM 100.19-23)<sup>95</sup>

[2.37b] Forðon þa ærestan synne se weriga gast scyde þurh þa næddran, ond Euae þa swa swa lichoma wæs lustfulliende, ond Ádám heo þonne swa swa gast gefafode: ða wæs seo synn gefylled. Ond micel nedþearfnis is, þætte mid gescead betwihan þa scynisse 7 þa lustfulnisse 7 eft betweohn þa lustfulnisse 7 þa gefafunge **þæt mood seolf his dema sy**. (Miller 86.28-34)<sup>96</sup>

In each of these conditions, individuals are asked to balance their worldly and spiritual lives by self-assessing their fitness to enter sacred space, according to their physical and mental state.

The translator draws attention to this relationship between body and consciousness in *Interrogation* 9 in a doubling to replace *mentium* (CM 92.27):

[2.38] Bonarum quippe **mentium** est, et ibi aliquo modo culpas suas agnoscere ubi culpa non est, quia saepe sine culpa agitur quod uenit ex culpa; unde etiam cum esuriemus, sine culpa comedimus, quibus ex culpa primi hominis factum est ut esuriamus. (CM 92.27-30)

---

<sup>94</sup> Whatever man sees his wife, not with desire for incorrect pleasure, but for the sake of bringing about procreation alone, this man is to be allowed his own judgement, whether as to going into the church, or to receiving the sacrament of Christ’s body and his blood; because we should not prohibit him to receive the holy sacrament, who is placed in the fire and cannot burn.

<sup>95</sup> “It was the serpent who suggested the first sin, Eve representing the flesh was delighted by it, and Adam representing the spirit consented to it: and when the mind sits in judgement on itself it is necessary to make careful distinction between suggestion and delight, between delight and consent.” (CM 101)

<sup>96</sup> Because the accursed spirit suggested the first sin through the serpent, and Eve then as the body was delighted, and Adam then as the spirit consented: then the sin was fulfilled. And there is great need, that the mind sit in judgement on itself, with distinction between the suggestion and the delight and again between the delight and the consent.

[2.38b] Forðon þara godra **mooda 7 monna** þeaw bið, þæt heo þær hwilum synne ongeotað, þær þe syn ne bið, 7 oft buton synne bið doen, þætte of synne cymeð: swa swa þæt is, þonne us eac hyngreð, þæt we etað buton synne, 7 us þæt wæs geworden of synne þæs ærestan monnes, þæt us eac hyngran meahte. (Miller 78.34-80.3)

Although *mód* is used frequently to replace *mens*, suggesting an automatic association, *mon* added here introduces an explicit connection between the mind and the human condition, emphasising physicality and the relationship between thought, behaviour, and judgement.

*Þoncmeotunge 7 þreodunge* (*deliberatione* CM 100.27, Miller 88.4) further highlights the body/mind relationship, drawing attention to the role of introspection in behavioural choices:

[2.39] ... ; cum uero delectare caro coeperit, tunc peccatum incipit nasci; si autem etiam **ex deliberatione** consentit, tunc peccatum cognoscitur perfici. (CM 100.25-28)<sup>97</sup>

[2.39b] Mid þy þonne se lichoma onginneð lustfullian, þonne onginneð þær seo syn acenned beon. Gif he þonne **mid þoncmeotunge 7 þreodunge** geþeafað, þonne bið ongyten þær syn gefremed beon. (Miller 88.2-4)<sup>98</sup>

The translator's doubled addition to this passage, which is part of an exegetical meditation on the nature of sin invoking a passage from Genesis (Gen. 3:1-6: Eve and the serpent), emphasises introspection aided by scriptural meditation rather than autonomous self-analysis. The doubling augments Gregory's assertion that incorrect thought, in this case conscious consideration and consent to impure behaviour, completes the action of sin by involving the mind and judgement along with the body. Such emphasis impresses the importance of correct modes of thought in avoidance of sin and progress towards a clean lifestyle.

---

<sup>97</sup> "when the flesh begins to delight in it then sin begins to arise. But if the mind deliberately consents, then the sin is seen to be complete." (CM 101)

<sup>98</sup> When the body begins to delight, then the sin begins to be born. If then he consents with thought and deliberation, then is the sin understood to be committed.

Although the translator acknowledges and emphasises the mind/body connection through *mooda 7 monna*—and acknowledges the self-reflection which Gregory advocates in his translations of [2.36] and [2.37]—[2.35] falls within an untranslated passage, reducing the presence of introspection as part of judgement in the translator’s version.<sup>99</sup> Instead, the translator emphasises the role of scripture in the deliberation and judgement of *consideratio*. *To smeageanne 7 to geþencenne* (*pensandum* CM 96.35, Miller 84.3) in *Interrogation* 8 is associated with a biblical reading:

[2.40] Vigilanti uero mente **pensandum** est, quod in Sina monte Dominus ad populum locuturus prius eundem populum abstinere a mulieribus praecepit. Et si illic, ubi Dominus per creaturam subditam hominibus loquebatur, tanta prouisione est munditia corporis requisita, ut qui uerba Dei perciperent mulieribus mixti non essent, quanto magis mulieres, quae corpus Domini omnipotentis accipiunt, custodire in se munditiam carnis debent, ne ipsa inaestimabilis mysterii magnitudine grauentur? (CM 96.35-98.7)<sup>100</sup>

[2.40b] Mid wæccre moode is **to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne**, þæt, þa he Drihten wolde his folc gesprecende beon in Sinai dūne, he þa ærest behead, þæt heo heora hrægl woosce 7 clænsode 7 heo from wiifum ahæfde. Ono nu in þære stówe, þær þe Drihten wæs þurh þa underðeoddan gesceafte to monnum spreocende, mid swa micle forseonesse wæs þæs lichoman clænnisse asoht, þæt, þa ðe Godes worde onfengon, ne sceoldon wiifum gemengde beon, micle ma þonne þa wiif, ða ðe ælmehteges Drihtnes lichoman onfooð, in him seolfum sculon lichoman clænnisse healdan, þy

<sup>99</sup> See Appendix B.

<sup>100</sup> “It should be considered carefully that when the Lord was about to speak to the people from Mount Sinai he first commanded them to abstain from women. And if such a standard of bodily purity was demanded when the Lord spoke to men through a creature as his substitute, that those who received the words of the Lord were not to approach women, how much more carefully should women who are receiving the Body of the omnipotent Lord preserve the purity of the flesh lest they be weighed down by the greatness of that inestimable Mystery.” (CM 99)

læs heo mid þa seolfan micelnisse þæs ungezhtendlican gerynes hefigade  
syn. (Miller 84.2-12)<sup>101</sup>

This replacement recalls earlier emphasis of scripture in its authorising capacity through the doublings *lærde 7 cwæð* (Miller 66:12), *weotan 7 leorniað* (Miller 78.10), *areccende 7 cwæð* (*subiect exponens* CM 94.11; Miller 80.11), and *underðeodde 7 æftercwæð* (*adnuntians subiungit* CM 94.18, Miller 80.18; *subiungere* CM 96.32, Miller 82.32). The translator's attention to the concept of consideration and thought, evident in his doubling *to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne*, here encourages the reader to apply a "vigilant mind" to meditation (*pensandum*; *to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne*) on scripture through repetition of the medium for that application: consideration and thought. Such consideration and active control of the mind as it reflects on sin and behaviour aid the progress of the reader towards that for which *consideratio*'s balancing between material and physical concerns strives—salvation through a clean, Christian lifestyle.

As we have seen, throughout the *Libellus* the translator uses doublings to place rhetorical emphasis on concepts of behaviour, consideration (whether through learning or introspection), and thought (as part of behavioural decision making and judgement) as part of the path to an ideal Christian lifestyle. The rudiments of this ideal state of Christian existence are outlined at the close of *Interrogation* 1, in which Gregory describes a life *godum þeawum*, in which *from eallum unalyfednessum beora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden* (see [2.15]/[2.15b]), to be kept by servants of God in the new English Church. Each decision and behaviour is to accord with this rule of 'clean' living, balancing material and spiritual concerns.

---

<sup>101</sup> With watchful mind is to be meditated on and to be considered, that, when the Lord would speak to his people on Mount Sinai, he then commanded first, that they wash and cleanse their garments and they abstain from women. Indeed now in that place, where the Lord was speaking to men through the subject creation, with so much care was cleanliness of the body sought, that, who received God's word, should not be joined with women, much more than the women, who receive the body of the almighty Lord, should hold bodily cleanliness in themselves, lest they are burdened with the greatness of the inestimable mystery itself.



## *Cleanliness and Purity*

In his translation of the passage outlining the ideal Christian mode of life in *Interrogation* 1, the translator places particular emphasis on the concept of purity, or cleanliness, as part of this lifestyle:

[2.15] De eorum quoque stipendio cogitandum atque prouidendum est, et sub ecclesiastica regula sunt tenendi, ut bonis moribus uiuant et canendis psalmis inuigilent, et ab omnibus illicitis et cor et linguam et corpus Deo auctore conseruent (CM 80.18–22)<sup>102</sup>

[2.15b] Swylce eac be heora ondlifne is to þencenne 7 to foreseonne, þæt heo godum þeawum lifgen under cirlecum regole 7 sealmas to singenne 7 wæccan to bigongenne, 7 from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum **clæne** healden. (Miller 66.3–7)<sup>103</sup>

The translator's addition of *clæne* to this passage introduces a 'purity' not present in the Latin version. This purity, as described in the translator's passage, should encompass all aspects of a Christian life—the heart (or spirit), the tongue (or speech), and the body, both in terms of its physical self and of its behaviour.

The OE version of *Interrogation* 8 draws attention to this connection between purity, thought, and behaviour, again in an exegetical context:

[2.41] Nam cum multa lex uelut **inmunda** manducare prohibeat, in euangelio tamen Dominus dicit: 'Non quod intrat in os **coinquinat** hominem, sed quae exeunt de ore, illa sunt quae **coinquant** hominem', atque paulo post subiecit exponens: 'Ex corde exeunt cogitationes malae.' Vbi ubertim indicatum est, quia illud ab omnipotente Deo **pollutum** esse in

---

<sup>102</sup> Care must also be taken and provision made for their stipends and they must be kept under ecclesiastical rule, living a moral life and staying awake for singing of psalms, and keeping body and tongue and heart from all things unlawful under the authority of God.

<sup>103</sup> Likewise also about their living is to be considered and to be reasoned, so that they live in good customs under Church rule and sing psalms and wake to worship, and from all things unlawful hold their hearts and tongues and bodies clean for God almighty.

opere ostenditur, quod ex **pollutae** cogitationis radice generatur. (CM 94.8-15)<sup>104</sup>

[2.41b] Forþon, mid þy seo æ monig þing bewereð to etanne, swa swa **unclæne**, hwæðre in godspelle Drihten cwæð: Nales þætte ingongeð in muð monnan **besmíteð**, ac þa ðe utgongað of muðe, þa seondan þe þone monnan **besmíteð**. 7 wene æfter þon wæs þæt areccende 7 cwæð: Of heortan utgongað yfele geþóhtas. Þær genihtsumlice is gesægd, þætte þæt from þæm ælmihtegum Gode **unclæne 7 besmiten** æteawed bið in weorce beon, þætte of wyrtruman **besmitenes** geþohtes 7 **unclænes** acenned bið. (Miller 80.7-11)<sup>105</sup>

In this passage, the translator constructs a network of uses of *unclæne* and *besmiten* in his translation of Gregory's exegetical examination of Matthew 15:11, replacing the Latin text's three key terms expressing impurity—*inmundus*, *coinquino*, and *polluo*—with a reduced vocabulary of two terms: *unclæne*, and *besmitan* or *besmitenes*.

Although not atypical of the translator's general practice when replacing these three Latin words, in this case such replacement creates a pattern in which key ideas in the passage, communicated by *unclæne* and *besmíteð*, are developed towards a climactic synthesis. To achieve this resolution, the translator forms two doublings replacing two instances of *polluo*, using the key words *unclæne* and *besmíteð* (*besmiten(es)*) previously used to replace *inmundus* and *coinquino*: *unclæne 7 besmiten*, and *besmitenes ... 7 unclænes*. In this way, the translator extends and intensifies the rhetorical effect of *conduplicatio*, present in the Latin in repetitions of *coinquino* and

---

<sup>104</sup> "For as the law forbids the eating of many things as unclean, nevertheless in the gospel the Lord said: 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, that defileth a man.' And shortly afterwards He added in explanation, 'Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts.' Whence it is abundantly clear that that is shown by Almighty God to be polluted indeed which is rooted in polluted thought." (CM 95)

<sup>105</sup> Thus, when the law prohibits to eat many things, as unclean, nevertheless in the Gospel the Lord says: Not that which goes into the mouth of man defiles, but that which goes out of the mouth, that is what defiles the man. And it was a little after that he explained and said: Evil thoughts go out of the heart. There it is sufficiently said, that that which is shown by almighty God to be unclean and polluted in act, that is produced from the root of polluted and unclean thought.

*polluo*, allowing this device to unify the passage through the amplified concept of impurity.

The translator also amplifies the connection between impurity and thought expressed in this passage, using his translation for the Latin's *cogitationis* to disrupt his established rhetorical pattern of repetitions of *unclæne* and *besmiten*:

[2.42] *pollutae cogitationis*

[2.42b] *besmitenes geþohtes 7 unclænes*

This disruption, enacted by the placement of *þohte* (translating *cogitationis*) between elements of the reversed repetition of *unclæne 7 besmiten* which translates *pollutae* here, emphasises the idea of 'thought' or mental process and draws added attention to the concept of 'impure thought'.

Such 'impurity' is juxtaposed with its opposite in an adjoinder of St. Paul immediately following, in which the translator continues his rhetorical pattern of repetitions of *clæne*, *unclæne*, and *besmiten*:

[2.43] Vnde Paulus quoque apostolus dicit: 'Omnia **munda mundis**, **coinquatis** autem et **infidelibus** nihil est **mundum**', atque mox eiusdem causam **coinquationis** adnuntians subiungit: '**Coinquinata** sunt enim et mens eorum et conscientia.' (CM 94.15-18)<sup>106</sup>

[2.43b] Bi þon swelce Paulus se apostol cwæð: Eall bið **clæne clænum**: þæm **besmitenum 7 ungeleafsumum** noht bið **clæne**. 7 he sona se apostol þone intingan þære ilcan **besmitenesse** wæs gesecgende, 7 æfter cwæð: Forðon **bismiten** syndon ge heora mód ge ingewitnis. (Miller 80.14-19)<sup>107</sup>

Here, bodily impurity is directly equated with impurity of the mind and conscience, and bodily and spiritual pollution identified with imperfect faith (*infidelibus*/

---

<sup>106</sup> "So the Apostle Paul also says: 'Unto the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure.' And further on, declaring the cause of that defilement he adds: 'For even their mind and conscience is defiled.'" (CM 95)

<sup>107</sup> About this also Paul the apostle says: 'All is clean to the clean: to the polluted and unfaithful nothing is clean.' And immediately the apostle declared what the cause of that same pollution was, and spoke further: 'Because they are polluted in their mind and understanding.'

*ungeleafsumum*). These negatives are juxtaposed with the ideal state of purity, in which ‘all things are clean’ (*omnia munda/ eall bið clæne*).

Such a figurative understanding of these descriptions of bodily purity and impurity is further encouraged in the following passage, in which ritual cleansing of an impure body before entering sacred space is explained:

[2.44] Vir autem cum propria coniuge dormiens, nisi **lotus aqua**, intrare ecclesiam non debet; sed neque lotus intrare statim debet. Lex autem ueteri populo praecepit, ut mixtus uir mulieri et **lauari aqua** debeat et ante solis occasum ecclesiam non intrare (CM 94.22-25)<sup>108</sup>

[2.44b] Se wer, se þe mid his ágene wiife bið slæpende, nemne he mid **wætre aþwegen 7 bibaðod sy**, ne sceal he in circan gongan, ne, þeah þe he bibaðod si, sona mot ingongan. Forþon seo á bibead þæm aldan Godes folce, þætte se wer, se ðe wære his wiife gemenged, þæt he sceolde **wætre aðwegen 7 bebaðad beon**, 7 ær sunnan setlgonge ne moste in heora gesomnunge ingongan. (Miller 80.22-27)<sup>109</sup>

The translator accents the process of cleansing the body, made impure by sexual contact, through repeated construction of doubled replacements for *lotus aqua* and *lavari aqua*: *wætre aþwegen 7 bibaðod sy*, and *wætre aðwegen 7 bebaðad beon*. The amplified imagery of cleansing highlights the impurity of preceeding behaviour, and recalls connections between the mind and sin already established, such as that addressed in extract 2.41/2.41b.

Accordingly, the image of bathing the impure body in water, here highlighted in the translation, is once again later qualified as a figurative representation of the cleansing of the polluted mind:

---

<sup>108</sup> “A man who has intercourse with his wife ought not to enter the church unless he has washed himself; and even when washed he ought not to enter immediately. Now the law commanded the ancient people that when a man had intercourse with a woman he ought to wash himself and should not enter the church before sunset” (CM 95)

<sup>109</sup> The man, when he is sleeping with his own wife, unless he is bathed and washed with water, he shall not go into the church, nor, when he is washed, may he go in immediately. Because the law asked that of the old people of God, that the man, when he was joined with his wife, that he should be washed and bathed with water, and must not go into their assembly before sunset.

[2.45] (quod tamen intellegi spiritaliter potest, quia mulieri uir miscetur, quando inlicitae concupiscentiae animus in cogitatione per delectationem coniungitur), quia, nisi prius ignis concupiscentiae a mente deferueat, dignum se congregationi fratrum aestimare non debet, qui se grauari per nequitam prauae uoluntatis uidet. (CM 94.25-30)<sup>110</sup>

[2.45b] þæt hwæðre mæg gastlice ongyten beon; forþon wer bið wiife gemenged, þonne unalyfedre willunge monnes mood in geþohte þurh lustfulnesse bið geþeoded. Forþon, nemne ær þæt fyr þære unrehtan willunge from þam mode acolie, ne sceal he hine wyrðne telgan broðra 7 Godes þeowa gesomnunge, seðe hine gesið hefigadne beon þurh yfelnesse unrehtes willan. (Miller 80.27-34)<sup>111</sup>

This qualification is carried forward onto later descriptions of cleansing, including a reversed echo of the augmenting doubling construction above ([2.44]/[2.44b]), *clænsnunge bæðes 7 þweales* (*lavacri purificationem* CM 94.34).

An image of cleansing is also added to the final passage of *Interrogation* 8, which invokes Exodus 19:15:

[2.46] Vigilanti uero mente pensandum est, quod in Sina monte Dominus ad populum locuturus prius eundem populum abstinere a mulieribus praecipit. (CM 96.35-98.2)<sup>112</sup>

[2.46b] Mid wæccre moode is to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne, þæt, þa he Drihten wolde his folc gesprecende beon in Sinai dūne, he þa ærest bebed,

---

<sup>110</sup> “but this can be explained in a spiritual sense. A man has intercourse with a woman when his mind is united with her in thought in the delights of illicit concupiscence, so unless the fire of concupiscence is first quenched in his mind he should not consider himself worthy of the company of his brethren while he sees himself burdened by the sinfulness of depraved desire.” (CM 95)

<sup>111</sup> That nevertheless may be perceived spiritually; because a man is joined with his wife, when unlawful desire is associated in the mind of a man with thought through lustfulness. Therefore, unless before that fire the incorrect desire is cooled from the mind, he shall not count him worthy of the brothers and of God’s servants, when he sees himself heavy through the evilness of incorrect desire.

<sup>112</sup> “It should be considered carefully that when the Lord was about to speak to the people from Mount Sinai he first commanded them to abstain from women.” (CM 99)

þæt heo heora hrægl woosce 7 clænsode 7 heo from wiifum ahæfde.  
(Miller 84.2-5)<sup>113</sup>

In effect, this addition not only adds to the standard of cleanliness and purity implied in this passage, by expanding the text using the biblical passage invoked (Exodus 19:15), but also connects this final depiction of bodily purity with those put forward to be understood figuratively earlier in the *Interrogation*, through the image of ritual washing and cleansing.

### *Penance and Discipline*

Each image of purification through ritual cleansing invoked here depicts a corrective measure: to amend impurity incurred through incorrect behaviour and thought. As their interweaving with ideas of consideration and self-judgement suggests, these corrective measures are largely self-governed. Elsewhere in the *Libellus*, however, the translator draws attention to correction imposed by authorities, or applied discipline. Such discipline is also closely associated with pensive decision-making and discriminate judgement. *Interrogation 3*'s *dihtað 7 findeð* (*dictat* CM 82.21, Miller 68.16) discussed earlier in relation to the concept of *consideratio* (see pp. 68-69) is found in a context of penal discipline for an extreme of 'unclean' behaviour—violation of sacred space through theft. The context and content of *Interrogation 3* modifies the idea of balanced judgement, emphasised in the translation through *dihtað 7 findeð*, to incorporate love and mercy into punishment for incorrect behaviours.

'Selection' governed by 'love' forms the focus of Gregory's response to *Interrogation 3*, in which the translator develops a proximate relationship between *wite* and the idea of 'love':

---

<sup>113</sup> With watchful mind is to be meditated on and to be considered, that, when the Lord would speak to his people on Mount Sinai, he then commanded first, that they wash and cleanse their garments and they abstain from women.

[2.47] Et cum paulo districtius agitur, ex caritate agendum est et non ex furore, ... (CM 82.14-16)<sup>114</sup>

[2.47b] Ond þeah ðe þæt wiite hwene heardor 7 strongor don sý, þonne is hit of lufan to donne, nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse. (Miller 68.5-7)<sup>115</sup>

In the case of the dative usage *wiitum*, the only occurrence of *wite* in *Interrogation* 3 with a corresponding Latin word in the original, the translator manufactures propinquity with *lufu* by adding *lufiað* to the following clause:

[2.48] Sic enim nos fidelibus tenere disciplinam debemus, sicut boni patres carnalibus filiis solent, quos et pro culpis uerberibus feriunt, et tamen ipsos quos **doloribus** adfligunt habere heredes quaerunt, et quae possident, ipsis seruant quos irati insequi uidentur. (CM 82. 16-20)<sup>116</sup>

[2.48b] Forþon þys gemete we sculon men þreagean, swa swa ða goodan fædras gewuniað heora flæslecu bearn, þa heo for heora synnum þreageaþ 7 swingað; ond hwæðre þa seolfan, þe heo mid þam wiitum þreagað 7 swencað, lufiað eac 7 wilniað him to ærfewardum to habbenne; 7 heora weoruldgod, þa heo ágan, him healdað þa ðe heo geare gesegene beoð eahtan 7 witnian. (Miller 68.9-15)<sup>117</sup>

The impression the translator creates, through his initial addition of *wiite* to the ‘question’, of multiple possible *witu* from which one must be selected is thus reinforced with each repetition of *wite*, and connected directly to the concept of ‘love’ in sense and syntactic proximity.

---

<sup>114</sup> “And when the punishment is more severe, it must be administed in love and not in anger” (CM 83)

<sup>115</sup> And nevertheless when that punishment is done a little harder and stronger, then it is done out of love, not out of desire nor out of hot-heartedness.

<sup>116</sup> “We ought to maintain discipline among the faithful as good fathers do with their children according to the flesh; they beat them with stripes for their faults and yet the very ones they chastise, they intend to make their heirs; and they keep whatever they possess for those whom they appear to persecute in their anger.” (CM 83)

<sup>117</sup> Therefore we should discipline men in this manner, just as good fathers are wont to their fleshly children, who they discipline and beat for their sins; and nevertheless they themselves, when they discipline and pain with that punishment, also love them and desire to raise them up afterwards; and their worldly goods, that they possess, they reserve for them who they are formerly perceived to persecute and punish.

This connection between considered judgement, punishment, and love is reinforced in the translation later, as the translator forms the doubling *dibtað 7 findeð* to translate *dictat* (extract 2.35/2.35b). The action implied by *dictat* and its corresponding doubling *dibtað 7 findeð* in *Interrogation 3* differs from that of previously discussed expressions of cogitation, such as *placet* and *þynceð 7 bet licað* (CM 80.33, Miller 66.19). Rather than indicating thought as part of the decision-making process of a character, such as Augustine or Gregory, the performer of the consideration implied through *dibtað 7 findeð* is an abstract entity, “love” (*caritas* CM 82.20; *lufu* Miller 68.15), which is *á in þæm moode to baldanne* (Miller 68.15). Although the translator adheres closely to the Latin word order and sense in this particular passage, he makes small alterations elsewhere in *Interrogation 3* to emphasise the idea of ‘love’ in relation to judgement and punishment, such as the addition of *lufiað* identified above. The translator also adjusts the presentation of opposing concepts to accentuate the primacy of ‘love’ in Gregory’s advice. Where *caritate* (CM 82.14) is opposed with *furore* (CM 82.15) at the opening of Gregory’s exposition of proper interaction between emotion and discipline, the translator maintains a conservative replacement for *caritas*, but expands *furor* into a doubling centring on the negative *nales/ne*:

[2.47] Et cum paulo districtus agitur, ex caritate agendum est et non ex furore, ... (CM 82.14-15)<sup>118</sup>

[2.47b] Ond þeah ðe þæt wiite hwene heardor 7 strongor don sý, þonne is hit of lufan to donne, nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse. (Miller 68.5-7)<sup>119</sup>

The repeated negatives inherent in the translator’s doubling *nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse* reinforce a preference for *caritas/lufu*. The contextual definition of *lufan*

<sup>118</sup> “And when the punishment is more severe, it must be administed in love and not in anger” (CM 83)

<sup>119</sup> And nevertheless when that punishment is done a little harder and stronger, then it is done out of love, not out of desire nor out of hot-heartedness.



here is also sharpened through its suggested opposites, *welme* and *hatheortnesse* (*furore* CM 82.15).<sup>120</sup>

*Hatheortnesse* in *Interrogation* 3 associates both its doubling partner, *welme*, and its opposition, *lufan*, with the heart (*heorte*) as an emotional and motivational centre. The incorporation of *heorte* into a compound here also references other uses of *heorte* in this way, particularly the more frequently employed and directly opposing *mildheortnesse*, promoted in *Interrogation* 1:

[2.49] þæm lifendum þonne in gemænum life hwæt is us to sprecenne, hu  
heo heora ælmesse dæle oðþe gestliðnesse bigonge 7 **mildheortnesse** fyllen?  
(Miller 66.7-9)<sup>121</sup>

Six of its seven uses elsewhere in the *HE* are associated with Christ ([2.52]), God ([2.53]), or the heavenly realm ([2.54]):

[2.50]

*II:I* Cwæð he: Wel þæt is cweden Dere, de ira eruti; heo sculon of Godes  
yrre beon abrogdene, 7 to **Cristes mildheortnesse** gecegde. (Miller 96.27-9)  
<sup>122</sup>

At ille ‘Bene’ inquit ‘Deiri, de ira eruti et ad **misericordiam Christi** vocati.  
(CM 134.5-6)<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> *Furor* is replaced with a doubling in two out of its three translated instances, both of which incorporate *welme* (1.7 *furore* CM 30.25, *wylme* 7 *yrre* Miller 36.30; 1.27 as above). *Welme* thus appears to constitute a common element in the translator’s rendering of *furor*, although for its single autonomous translation the translator chooses *hatheortnesse* (*furore* CM 152.20, Miller 112.22).<sup>30</sup> Like many of the translator’s doublings, then, *nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse* here seems to consist of a habitual translation, *welme* (fervour), and an added element, *hatheortnesse* (literally ‘hot-heartedness’).

<sup>121</sup> What is there for us to say about those who live life in common, how they divide alms or observe hospitality and fulfill compassion?

<sup>122</sup> He said: “Deiri is well spoken, *de ira eruti*; they should be plucked from God’s wrath and called to Christ’s mercy.

<sup>123</sup> “‘Deiri’, he replied, ‘*De ira!* good! snatched from the wrath of Christ and called to his mercy.’” (CM 135)

[2.51]

*III.XI* ... þæt he callum monnum sægde 7 bodade þa **mildheortnesse** þæs **arfæstan scyppendes** 7 þæt wuldor his getreowan þeowes. (Miller 192.18: **clementiam pii Conditoris**, CM 254.23-4)<sup>124</sup>

*IV.III* ... gif he æt leorninga sæte oððe elles hwæt dyde, gif semninga mare blæd windes astah, þæt he sona instæpe **Drihtnes mildheortnesse** gecege 7 þa miltse bæd monna cynne. (Miller 268.15-17: **misericordiam Domini**, CM 342.20-22)<sup>125</sup>

*IV.III* Forþon **Drihten** lyfte ontyneð, windas weceð, legetas sceotað of heofonum 7 hleoðrað, .../... þæt we sona cleopien 7 bidden **his mildheortnesse** ... (Miller 268.29-270.6: **Dominus ... misericordiam** CM 342-4. 31-9)<sup>126</sup>

*IV.XI* þa ðæt þa swa wæs, þa onhelde heo to þam liice ond in gemet þara biddendra, swa swa heo to hire lifigendre spræce, bæd þæt heo funde 7 abæde æt þæs **arfæstan sceppendes mildheortnesse**, þæt heo from swa miclum clæmnessum 7 swa singalum onlesed beon moste. (Miller 288-90.32-2: **misericordiam pii Conditoris**, CM 362.1)<sup>127</sup>

[2.52]

*III.XIV* ... ac in gemynd þæs wundres in þa ciricon setton, þætte þa ingongendan þær heora cneo begaan scolden 7 him **heofonlicre mildheortnesse** wilnian 7 secan. (Miller 204.29: **misericordiae caelesti**, CM 264.30)<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> And wheresoever he came, he spoke and preached the mercy of the gracious creator and the glory of his faithful servant.

<sup>125</sup> If he sat at study or did whatever else, if suddenly a greater blast of wind arose, then he immediately begged the Lord's mercy and asked for mercy to mankind.

<sup>126</sup> For the Lord releases the air, awakens the winds, shoots lightnings from heaven and thunders .../... [so that] we may at once ask and entreat his mercy.

<sup>127</sup> When that was done, then she leaned to the body and in likeness to one in prayer, as if she spoke to her in life, asked that she seek and ask the mercy of our gracious creator, that she may be released from such great and continuous pain.

<sup>128</sup> But in memory of the miracle they placed it in the church, so that those who entered should bend their knee and wish and seek the mercy of heaven for themselves.

This frequent association of *mildbeornesse* ('mercy') with Christ and God projects additional negativity onto its antonym, *hatbeornesse*, and associates its presented opposite, *lufu*, with God in turn. The translator's use of *hatbeornesse* here thus suggests incorporation of 'heavenly mercy' into the idea of 'love' as it is promoted in *Interrogation* 3 through its antonym, *mildbeornesse*.

'Love', and the compassion it implies when associated with 'mercy', is further emphasised through subtraction in this *Interrogation*. The translator is careful to associate anger or 'fervour' as a motivator with a negative consistently, as in *nales of welme ne of hatbeornesse*, and to maintain a continual preference for *caritas* or *lufu* as the guiding feeling behind correction. Where the Latin text appears to lose this consistency, the text is altered in translation to remove apparent conflation of motivations:

[2.53] ... et tamen ipsos quos **doloribus** adfligunt habere heredes quaerunt, et quae possident, ipsis seruant quos **irati insequi** uidentur. (CM 82.18-20)<sup>129</sup>

[2.53b] ... ond hwæðre þa seolfan, þe heo mid þam wiitum þreagað 7 swencað, **lufiað** eac 7 wilniað him to ærfewardum to habbenne; 7 heora weoruldgod, þa heo ágan, him healdað þa ðe heo geare gesegene beoð **eahtan 7 witnian**. (Miller 68.11-15)<sup>130</sup>

The translator here edits out *irati* ('angry') in association with *insequi* ('attack, persecute'). Without an opposing positive motivation and accompanying negative, *irati* translated here would disrupt the dissociation of punishment and anger emphasised through the translator's connection of *wite* and *lufu* and demotion of motivations other than *lufu*. Replacing *insequi* with the emphatic doubling *eahtan 7 witnian* and removing *irati* as a motivation thus refers *eahtan 7 witnian* back to

<sup>129</sup> "and yet the very ones they chastise, they intend to make their heirs; and they keep whatever they possess for those whom they appear to chastise in their anger." (CM 83)

<sup>130</sup> ... and nevertheless they themselves, when they discipline and pain with that punishment, also love them and desire to raise them up afterwards; and their worldly goods, that they possess, they reserve for them who they are formerly perceived to persecute and punish.

*lufiað*, maintaining exclusive positive correlation between judgement, punishment, and love.

The translator's amendments to *Interrogation* 3 concerning *rihtung* ('correction') and *wite* ('punishment') thus direct the reader towards an alignment between punishment and love while simultaneously incorporating heavenly mercy. This association seems also to permeate the translator's treatment of the options for punishment suggested in the Latin text. *Interrogation* 3 addresses theft of material possessions from the Church, an issue with both secular and ecclesiastic relevance. Indeed, as John R. C. Martyn has noted, Ethelberht of Kent placed his rulings regarding theft from Churches first among his Laws (63). Alfred himself includes punishments for theft from the Church in his Laws, recommending that along with the return of the pilfered articles the hand with which they were stolen be struck off, in his sixth *æ* (Attenborough 66). While Gregory's recommendations are "certainly milder" (Martyn 63) than Alfred's, the OE translator's rendition of Gregory's rulings is milder still. The OE version of the *Interrogation*, as previously considered, suggests multiple 'punishments' (from which one must be selected according to situation), through addition of *wiite* to the 'question'. As the text moves on to list possible appropriate corrective measures, however, the translator selectively edits the options presented:

[2.54] Sunt enim quidam, qui habentes subsidia furtum perpetrant, et sunt alii, qui hac in re inopia delinquant; unde necesse est, ut quidam damnis, quidam uero uerberibus, et quidam districtius, quidam autem lenius corrigantur. (CM 82.10-14)<sup>131</sup>

[2.54b] Forðon sume syndon þa ðe habbað woruldspede 7 hwæðre stale fremmað, sume seondon þa þe in þisse wiisan þurh wæðelnesse agyltað.

---

<sup>131</sup> "For there are some who commit theft though they have resources, while others transgress in this matter through poverty. So some must be punished by fines, some by a flogging, some severely and others more leniently." (CM 83)

Forðon is ned þætte sume mid woningum sume þearlicor, sume liðelecor,  
synd gerehte. (Miller 68.1-5)<sup>132</sup>

Particularly from *unde necesse est*, the translation adheres closely to the Latin word order and sense in this passage, but makes one significant subtraction. Where the Latin text explicitly includes corporeal discipline *verberibus* ('with whips'), the OE version moves straight on to the severity of the penalty, leaving punishment *mid woningum* ('with reduction': *damnis*) as the sole recommendation.<sup>133</sup> The OE version thus presents a decision between appropriate levels of one non-physical penalty, and applies the Latin text's advice on severity (*et quidam districtus, quidam autem lenius corrigantur*; *sume þearlicor, sume liðelicor, synd gerehte*) directly to *wanung*.

Some physicality is restored, however, through the translator's second replacement for *districtus*, first rendered with *þearlicor* (extract 2.58/2.58b):

[2.47] Et cum paulo **districtus** agitur, ex caritate agendum est et non ex furore, ... (CM 82.14-15)<sup>134</sup>

[2.47b] Ond þeah ðe þæt wiite hwene **heardor 7 strongor** don sý, þonne is hit of lufan to donne, nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse. (Miller 68.5-7)

<sup>135</sup>

Two such disparate translations in close proximity suggest that the translator has consciously selected each element of the doubling to produce a particular effect.

---

<sup>132</sup> Because when there are some that have worldly wealth and nevertheless carry out theft, there are some who offend in this way through poverty. Thus it is needful that some are corrected with deprivation (fines), some severely, some mildly.

<sup>133</sup> Interestingly, MS B has *mid geswincum* ('labour, exercise, inconvenience, fatigue, trouble, affliction, tribulation, torment, temptation, banishment' (Bosworth & Toller)) rather than *mid woningum*. The B scribe, who also abridges considerably throughout the work, thus restores a sense of general physicality without the specification of *verberibus* (with whips), but removes the detached punishment indicated by *damnis*, forcing attention onto physical penalty alone.

<sup>134</sup> "And when the punishment is more severe, it must be administered in love and not in anger" (CM 83)

<sup>135</sup> And nevertheless when that punishment is done a little harder and stronger, then it is done out of love, not out of desire nor out of hot-heartedness.

*District(i)us* is used infrequently in the Latin text, and translated only four times (twice in 1.27 as above; *districtius* CM 426.22, *beardwendlice* Miller 356.15; *districto* CM 422.13, *pearlwisan* Miller 350.15-16). While the elements *pearl* and *beard* appear to share association with *district(i)us*, the added *strang*, particularly when connected with *don*, introduces a sense of physical strength and action.

The translator also removes explicit corporeal punishment from his rendering of the simile accompanying Gregory's advice on appropriate punishment, likening 'discipline among the faithful' to parental discipline:

[2.48] Sic enim nos fidelibus tenere disciplinam debemus, sicut boni patres carnalibus filiis solent, quos et pro culpis uerberibus **feriunt**, et tamen ipsos quos doloribus **adfligunt** habere heredes quaerunt, et quae possident, ipsis seruant quos irati insequi uidentur. (CM 82. 16-20)<sup>136</sup>

[2.48b] Forþon þys gemete we sculon men þreagean, swa swa ða goodan fædras gewuniað heora flæslecu bearn, þa heo for heora synnum þreageaþ 7 swingað; ond hwæðre þa seolfan, þe heo mid þam wiitum þreagað 7 swencað, lufiað eac 7 wilniað him to ærfewardum to habbenne; 7 heora weoruldgod, þa heo ágan, him healdað þa ðe heo geare gesegene beoð eahtan 7 witnian. (Miller 68.9-15)<sup>137</sup>

Again, the sense of physicality depleted by the removal of explicit physical punishment is restored through the translator's doubling formations. Although *verberibus* is edited out of the translator's version of this passage, its customary replacement elsewhere in the translation text, *swingan* (*verbera* 2.6 CM 92.27, *swingan* Miller 114.23; *verberibus* 1.7 CM 19.33, *mid swinglan* Miller 36.32; 2.6 CM 154.20-21, *swingum* Miller 114.29), is incorporated into the translator's doubled

<sup>136</sup> "We ought to maintain discipline among the faithful as good fathers do with their children according to the flesh; they beat them with stripes for their faults and yet the very ones they chastise, they intend to make their heirs; and they keep whatever they possess for those whom they appear to persecute in their anger." (CM 83)

<sup>137</sup> Therefore we should discipline men in this manner, just as good fathers are wont to their fleshly children, who they discipline and beat for their sins; and nevertheless they themselves, when they discipline and pain with that punishment, also love them and desire to raise them up afterwards; and their worldly goods, that they possess, they reserve for them who they are formerly perceived to persecute and punish.

substitution for *feriunt*, *þreageaþ* 7 *swingað*. *þreagað* 7 *swencað* used to replace *adfligunt* soon after recalls this formation.

These co-operative doublings are each constructed using elements not typically associated with their corresponding Latin word. *Ferire* is translated four times over the OE version of the *HE*, and is replaced with *sleán* in all cases but this one (*feriat* 1.27 CM 92.1, *sleabð* Miller 78.4; *feriendum* 4.3 CM 344.6, *sleanne* Miller 270.4; *ferire* 1.7 CM 34.2, *sloge* Miller 40.13). While *adfligere* is translated into a more typical doubling consisting of one habitual (*swencað*) and one added (*þreagað*) element, it retains a clear semantic connection to the translator's replacement for *ferire* through *þreagað*, with which neither Latin word is generally associated in the translation.

The translator's selection of *þreágean* as an element of his replacements for *ferire* and *adfligere* thus emerges as atypical and self-conscious. These two additions of *þreágean* join a pattern of five repetitions of *þreá* and *þreágean* evident in *Interrogation* 3, each instance recalling the sense of the others. Only one fragment of this pattern provides a literal translation for a corresponding Latin word:

[2.34] Haec ergo caritas in mente tenenda est, et ipsa modum **correctionis** dictat, ita ut mens extra rationis regulam omnino nihil faciat. (CM 82.20-22)<sup>138</sup>

[2.34b] Forðon seo lufu is á in þæm moode to haldanne, 7 hit þæt gemet þara þreá dihtað 7 findeð, swa ðætte þæt mód buton rihtum regole allinga nowiht deð. (Miller 68.15-17)<sup>139</sup>

Here the genitive noun *correctionis* is replaced with a parallel genitive construction *þara þreá*. Later, however, an accusative form (*þrea*) revises the Latin text's passive form of the verb *corrigere*, otherwise replaced with *gerihtan* (*corrigi* CM 82.10, *geriht* Miller 68.2; *corrigantur* CM 82.13-14, *gerehte* Miller 68.5):

<sup>138</sup> "So we must always keep love in mind and love must dictate the method of correction, so that we do not decide on anything unreasonable." (CM 83)

<sup>139</sup> Because love is always to be held in the spirit, and it dictates and finds that measure of discipline, so that the mind does nothing at all without correct governance.

[2.55] ... quia ipsi hoc preastatur qui **corrigitur**, ne gehennae ignibus tradatur. (CM 82.15-16)<sup>140</sup>

[2.55b] Forðon þæm menn þurh þa þrea þis bið gegearwod, þæt he ne sy seald þæm ecan fyrum helle tintreges. (Miller 68.7-9)<sup>141</sup>

The translator's inversion of noun and verb forms reinforces the connection between transgressor, punishment, and redemption in his version of this passage, removing the presence of a 'punisher' to focus on he who receives correction. Similarly, the translator revises the passage containing the doublings *þreageaþ 7 swingað* and *þreagað 7 swencað*, translating an accusative noun, *disciplinam*, or rather the phrase *tenere disciplinam*, with the verbal infinitive *þreágean*, thus including three instances of *þreágean* in very close proximity (extract 2.48/2.48b above). This condensed repetition intensifies the correlation between parental discipline and the modes of correction advocated in *Interrogation 3*.

*Interrogation 7* introduces a motivation to 'improve' the receiver of disciplinary action to Gregory's discourse on correction in the *Libellus*. This introduction is effected through the translator's doubled replacements for two particular Latin words: *corrigantur* and *accendendus*:

[2.56] cum eodem Arelatense episcopo debet agere qualiter, siqua sunt in episcopis uitia, **corrigantur**. Qui si forte in disciplinae uigore tepidus existat, tuae fraternitatis zelo **accendendus** est. (CM 86.33-37)<sup>142</sup>

[2.56b] hafa ðu mid þone ilcan biscop sprece 7 geþeahte hwæt to donne sy, oðþo gif hwelc uncyste in biscopum gemette syn, hu þa gerehte 7 gebette beon scylen. Ond gif wen sy, þæt he in strengo þeodscipes 7 þrea to wlæc

---

<sup>140</sup> "for it is bestowed on the one who is punished so that he shall not be delivered up to hell fire." (CM 83)

<sup>141</sup> Because through that discipline this is provided for that man, that he is not given to the eternal fires of hell's punishment.

<sup>142</sup> "you must consult with the bishop of Arles as to how such faults as are found among the bishops may be amended. If he should happen to be slack in his discipline he must be kindled by your zeal." (CM 87)



sy, þonne is he to onbærnenne 7 to gebetenne mid þinre broðorlicnesse  
lufan (Miller 72.25-74.3)<sup>143</sup>

In both cases, the translator forms his doubling from one habitual element—*geriht* and *onbærnan* respectively—and one added element. The translator chooses the same added element, *ge-bétan*, for both. Through *ge-bétan* (“to make better, improve” (Bosworth and Toller), the translator emphasises and expands the sense of ‘improvement’ implied through *corrigo* and *rihtan*. *Corrigantur* receives such treatment three times, all of which comprise part of doubled replacements. One of these replacements (*correcti* CM 422.1; *witnade 7 bette* Miller 350.2) reflects an association between punishment and improvement through *witnian*, and is atypical of the translator’s customary treatment of *corrigo*. The remaining two (of which *gerehte 7 gebette* in *Interrogation 7* is one), however, are formed from the same elements, the habitual *rihtan* and an added element, *ge-bétan*. Use of *ge-bétan* to replace *accendo* for the translation, whether as part of a doubling or autonomously, is unique to this one instance. Unlike *corrigo*, *accendo* does not contain a pre-existing implication of correction, which the translator then enhances. Instead, *ge-bétan* here expands the translator’s conception of *accendo/onbærnan*, adding “correction” to the process of “kindling” described here and investing Augustine with the power to “correct” the Bishop of Arles himself.

*Gerehte 7 gebette* and *to onbærnenne 7 to gebetenne* also provide a direct vocabulary connection between *Interrogation 7* and a narrative reference to its content and context in the body of the HE:

[2.57] Itaque Theodorus perlustrans uniuersa ordinabat locis oportunis  
episcopos, et ea quae minus perfecta repperit his quoque iuuantibus

---

<sup>143</sup> ... have conversation and consideration with that same bishop as to what is to be done, or if some error is found in the bishops, how that should be corrected and improved. And if it is expected, that he is strength of discipline and castigation is too tepid, then he is to be incited and to be improved with your brotherly love ...

**corrigebat.** In quibus et Ceadda episcopum cum argueret non fuisse rite consecratum, ... (CM 334.16-19)<sup>144</sup>

[2.57b] þa ferde Theodor biscop geond ealle Ongolcynnes mægðe, 7 biscopas halgode in gelimplecum stowum. Ond þa þing, þe he unfulfremed gemette, mid heora fultume he ða **rehte 7 bette**. Betweoh þon, þa he Ceddan biscop mid wordum þreade, þæt he rihtlice gehalgad ne wære, ... (Miller 258.33-260.2)<sup>145</sup>

Both the Latin and OE versions of this passage recall the issues raised in the *Libellus*, particularly 6 and 7. At this stage of the *HE* narrative, in IV:II, Theodore is a newly appointed Archbishop, imported from Italy after the only locally sourced candidate, Wigheard, dies before he is able to take office (CM 328-30; Miller 252-254). Along with Theodore's immediate action to consecrate new bishops throughout England, this lack of candidates suggests a shortage of local bishops at this time and mirrors Augustine's solitude as bishop in *Interrogation* 6 (CM 86.9-11; Miller 72.13-15).

This passage in Book IV also mirrors the context and advice of *Interrogation* 7, depicting Gregory's instructions to England's first archbishop, Augustine, on disciplinary action and collaboration with local bishops through Theodore's behaviour as archbishop. Although initially this passage seems to illustrate Theodore's correction of general imperfections throughout the English church, the depiction immediately following of Theodore's correction of Bishop Chad forces the reader's attention onto correction of customs and behaviour among bishops specifically, mirroring the focus of *Interrogation* 7's disciplinary aspect. The translator's *rehte 7 bette* in IV:II repeats the construction *gerehte 7 gebette* emphasising

---

<sup>144</sup> "So Theodore journeyed to every district, consecrating bishops in suitable places and, with their help, correcting whatever he found imperfect. Among these he made it clear to Bishop Chad that his consecration had not been regular, ..." (CM 335)

<sup>145</sup> "Then Bishop Theodore traversed the entire country of the English and consecrated bishops at suitable places. And whatever he found imperfect, he set right and improved with their help. At this time when he reproved Bishop Chad, saying, that his consecration was irregular, ..." (Miller 259-61)

improvement as part of discipline in *Interrogation 7*, enhancing the vocabulary alignment between *Interrogation 7* and this narrative demonstration of its context. The relationship between the improving discipline, emphasised through the translator's addition of *(ge-)bette*, and collaborative consideration is likewise repeated in IV:II through the relationship between the verbal doubling *rehte 7 bette* and the subordinate *mid heora fultume*. Considered alongside the several doublings cited at the beginning of this chapter (extract 2.2), each of which emphasises suffering in the context of inflicted or self punishment in *Interrogations 8* and *9*, the images of discipline and correction paid particular attention in the translator's *Interrogations 3* and *7* expose a penitential undercurrent in the *Libellus* text.

Throughout his version of the *Libellus*, then, the translator uses the doubling convention to develop a series of rhetorical repetitions of ideas critical to the moral objective of Gregory's *consideratio*, amplifying ideas of behavioural expectations, cogitation, collaboration, and correction. Each of these ideas represents an element of the path towards the clean Christian living described in *Interrogation 1*:

[2.15] De eorum quoque stipendio cogitandum atque providendum est, et sub ecclesiastica regula sunt tenendi, ut bonis **moribus** uiuant et canendis psalmis inuigilent, et ab omnibus illicitis et cor et linguam et corpus Deo auctore conseruent (CM 80.18-22)<sup>146</sup>

[2.15b] Swylce eac be heora ondlifne is to þencenne 7 to foreseonne, þæt heo godum **þeawum** lifgen under ciriclecum regole 7 sealmas to singenne 7 wæccan to bigongenne, 7 from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden. (Miller 66.3-7)<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> Care must also be taken and provision made for their stipends and they must be kept under ecclesiastical rule, living a moral life and staying awake for singing of psalms, and keeping body and tongue and heart from all things unlawful under the authority of God.

<sup>147</sup> Likewise also about their living is to be considered and to be reasoned, so that they live in good customs under Church rule and sing psalms and wake to worship, and from all things unlawful hold their hearts and tongues and bodies clean for God almighty.

These recurrent, subtle emendations reveal an overtone of concern with moral behaviour and penance in the translator's work on the *Libellus*, suggesting that these concerns held particular importance for his version of the text and his intentions in including it in his *HE*. As well as providing a relatively consistent window onto the translator's interests in, understanding of, and motivations for the *HE*, study of the doublings found in the translator's *Libellus* may thus also illuminate the function of the translator's *Interrogations* within the Old English *HE* as a whole.

### Chapter 3—“*For þinre ðearfe:*” The *Libellus* Within the *HE* as a Functional Text

Considered alongside the content of the *Libellus* and the changes made to it (such as the doublings examined in the previous chapter), the translator’s placement of this penitential text, in proximity to edifying episodes within the *HE*, transforms the *Libellus* into a component of the moralising apparatus of the translator’s new OE *Bede*, rather than preserving Bede’s function for it as a piece of documentation evidencing issues encountered in Augustine’s initial mission to the English. Theodore’s episode in IV:II (considered at the close of the previous chapter) demonstrates the potential that the *Libellus*, and the translator’s treatment of it in terms of vocabulary choice and editing, has for communication with elements of the wider *HE* narrative. In particular, the moralising concepts isolated through the translator’s doublings within the *Libellus*, and the penitential undertone they reveal, can be seen interacting with episodes of penitential value in the later three books of the *HE*.

Bede’s distribution of subject matter for the *HE*, which (as noted in chapter 1) works predominantly along chronological lines and structures a meta-narrative outlining five stages of Christian development, results in a higher concentration of narrative which could be interpreted as moralistic or penitential in the later books of the work. These books focus more on development of a Christian lifestyle and culture in England than on the conversion of the English and the early establishment of the Church, and are thus more concerned with the institution of correct behavioural modes. This chapter considers the function of the *Libellus* among these last three books of the *HE* as though, as Rowley suggests (“Shifting Contexts”), the translator’s placement of the *Libellus* in the position in which it is found in MS copies of the OE *Bede* were a conscious choice.

The position of the *Libellus* in extant manuscripts of the OE *Bede* supports this consideration materially. Although they show slight variation in format, all

surviving copies place the text between Books III and IV. Before beginning the *Libellus*, MS T leaves a small line gap, but does not appear to break the text. In fact, the apparent addition of a Latin introduction to the text, reading *Interrogationes sci agustini archi episꝑ et responso sci gregorii papae urbis romanorum*, filling half of the last line of Book III, chapter XXII (III: XXX) and one full line below, seems a deliberate attempt to link the *Libellus* text that follows into the preceding narrative structure physically.

Replicating the transition found in the Tanner MS, MS O does not break after the final narrative chapter of Book III, but continues to fill the half line and following full line after *hwurfan* at the end of III:XXII. Despite the various hands at work in MS O, and the evident ‘afterthought’ appearance of most of the rubricated Latin lines accenting the *Libellus*, it seems that while MS O does differentiate the *Libellus* as a stand alone text, it does not attempt to isolate it from the rest of Book III. Like MS T, MS O appears to make a particular effort to connect the physical text of the *Libellus* to that preceding.

The B manuscript, isolated from the others by its tendency to revise the translation text, seems to have no trouble with the placement of the *Libellus*. Indeed, the lack of Latin openings and specific distinction from the surrounding books suggest the B scribes were much less concerned with the text’s position than those of the other MSS. The *Libellus* is effectively assimilated into the rest of the text, distinguished only at their close by the same terminating formula found in the other MSS (*Dis seondon ondsware þæs eadigan papan Sanctus Gregorius to geþeahtunge 7 to frignesne þæs arwyrdan biscopes Agustinus*, Miller 88.26-7) before B launches straight into Book IV.

Although many leaves from chapters VII-XXIX of Book III survive in MS C, the text of the *Libellus* found in this manuscript was sadly lost in the Cotton fire of 1731. Nowell’s later transcript may provide some indication of the layout of the *Libellus* in the manuscript, but this must be considered with caution. The

transcripts show Latin openings in the same format as MSS T, O, and Ca, and enlarged capitals at the beginning of each question and answer. The point of excision in Book I repeats that in the previous three MSS. MS Ca's treatment of the *Libellus* text renders it distinct from Book III and presents it as a separate book, inserted between books three and four but part of neither. This interruption, although conservatively presented, highlights the text as conspicuous even more effectively than the elaborate embellishments of MS T or the red accents of MS O, drawing extra attention to the repositioned text.

The extent to which the manuscript evidence agrees suggests that the treatment of the *Libellus* text, as it is found in the extant manuscripts, does represent its original treatment by the translator. Although MS Ca may demonstrate the efforts of a later copyist to deal with the difficult placement of a text out of alignment with its Latin original, merely the presentation and organisation of the text seems to have been questioned. The overall nature of the MS Ca text, with its consistent inclusion of organisational tools such as chapter and page headings, would suggest that its variation has more to do with the meticulous habits of its copyist than with any significant difficulties surrounding the placement of the *Libellus* text. With the exception of the variation found in MS Ca, the treatment of the *Libellus* exhibited in all the extant copies entails assimilation of the *Libellus* into the body of Book III.

Thematically, the emphasis on consideration, appropriate behaviour, and correction evident in the doublings found in the OE *Libellus* corresponds with the penitential context of copies of the *Libellus* found outside Bede's *HE*. Despite the long tradition of suspicion surrounding the text's authenticity as an Augustinian/Gregorian document, evident in dialogue early enough as to be contemporary with Bede, the text enjoyed extensive dispersal both as a separate work and via Bede's *HE*. Meyvaert notes its survival in over 130 manuscripts not containing Bede's *HE*. From these 130, Meyvaert narrows his study to include forty-six various MSS, mainly

containing canonical or penitential collections (Meyvaert 23). Indeed, Deansley and Grosjean note in their discussion of the Gregorian authenticity of the text that the *Libellus* “would seem later to have had a wider circulation in such collections than in the *HE*. itself” (Deansley & Grosjean 13).

Bede’s reproduction aligns with a branch of the *Libellus* associated with a collection of Theodore of Canterbury’s penitential material (Meyvaert 26), addressing the “physiological characteristics of sin” (Friesen 172). This “early insular” *Libellus* has *Interrogatio beati Augustini episcopi Cantuariorum ecclesiae* in the first instance and *Interrogatio Augustini* for later questions, and *Respondit Gregorius papa urbis Romae* followed by *Respondit Gregorius papa* attached to replies, emphasising the identities of the dialogue participants. Continental texts tend to open questions with *Interrogatio* alone, while the formula remains consistent with insular versions for replies (Meyvaert 26. n.). Bede’s *HE* rendition of the *Libellus* exemplifies these early insular headings. This association between Bede’s version of the *Libellus* and Theodore’s *Penitentials* draws attention to the function of the *HE* itself as (among other things) a penitential, edifying text.

Although other agendas are implied in the content of the *HE*, Bede expresses a desire to correct his readers and encourage a life of “spiritual well-being” (CM 3) in his preface, presenting this instructional motivation foremost among his intentions for the work. Towards this moralistic end individual episodes, each featuring particular figures or groups with various social backgrounds, illustrate behaviours alongside their respective rewards or punishments throughout the work. Considered alongside Bede’s explicit statements of intent in his preface and the body of the work itself, the frequency with which a reader encounters episodes of moralising value when reading the text provides confirmation of Bede’s desire to create an edifying work.

Because the OE translator retains Bede’s preface for his translation, rather than formulating and adding his own as other translations of the Alfredian period



do, he also adopts Bede's didactic impetus (Discenza 72). Changes to the preface for the OE version, however, suggest that this motivation was not adopted for the translation by default, but was shared and promoted by the translator:

[3.1] ...; satisque studium tuae sinceritatis amplector, quo non solum audiendis scripturae sanctae uerbis aurem sedulus accommodas uerm etiam noscendis priorum gestis siue dictis, et maxime nostrae gentis uirorum inlustrium, curam uigilanter inpendis. Siue enim historia de bonis bona referat, ad imitandum bonum auditor sollicitus instigatur; seu mala commemoret de prauis, nihilominus religiosus ac pius auditor siue lector deuitando quod noxium est ac peruersum, ipse sollertius ad exsequenda ea quae bona ac Deo digna esse cognouerit, accenditur. Quod ipsum tu quoque uigilantissime deprehendens, historiam memoratam in notitiam tibi simul et eis, quibus te regendis diuina praefecit auctoritas, ob generalis curam salutis latius propalari desideras. (CM 2.10-18)<sup>148</sup>

[3.1b] ...; 7 ic getreowige on ðine geornfulnysse, forþon ðu eart swyðe gymende 7 smeagende caldra manna cwidas 7 dæda 7 ealra swyðost þara mærena weras ure þeode. Forðon þis gewrit oððe hit gód sagað be godum mannum, 7 se ðe hit gehyreþ, he onhyreþ þam, oððe hit yfel sagaþ be yfelum mannum, 7 se ðe hit gehyreð, he flyhð þæt 7 onscunaþ. Forþon hit is gód godne to herianne 7 yfelne to leanne, þæt se geðeo se þe hit gehyre. Gif se oðer nolde, hu wurð he elles gelæred? For þinre ðearfe 7 for þinre

---

<sup>148</sup> "I gladly acknowledge the unfeigned enthusiasm with which, not content merely to lend an attentive ear to the words of Holy Scripture, you devote yourself to learn the sayings and doings of men of old, and more especially the famous men of our own race. Should history tell of good men and their good estate, the thoughtful listener is spurred on to imitate the good; should it record the evil ends of wicked men, no less effectually the devout and earnest listener or reader is kindled to eschew what is harmful and perverse, and himself with greater care pursue those things which he has learned to be good and pleasing in the sight of God. This you perceive, clear-sighted as you are; and therefore, in your zeal for the spiritual well-being of us all, you wish to see my *History* more widely known, for the instruction of yourself and those over whom divine authority has appointed you to rule." (CM 3)

ðeode ic þis awrat; forþon ðe God to cyninge geceas, þe gedafenað þine  
þeode to læranne. (Miller 2.4-15)<sup>149</sup>

While the first clause of this passage is allowed to remain virtually intact, the translator thereafter employs several ‘strategic’ translations to redirect the preface’s expression of motivation and agency (Discenza 69). The translator excises Bede’s reference to Ceolwulf’s attention to the lessons of Scripture (*non solum audiendis scripturae sanctae uerbis aurem sedulus accomodas*), referring only to the lessons provided by historical events and figures, and enhances the authority of such lessons by emphasising the ‘diligent and inquisitive’ (*gymende 7 smeagende*) nature of Ceolwulf’s attention to them. The OE version’s construction of moral example, to be taken forward into reading of the text, rests entirely on the *ealdra manna cwidas 7 dæda* that permeate the narrative, suggesting that these *cwidas 7 dæda* will be given particular attention in the translation.

The translator also emphasises the didactic quality of this moral responsibility, adding two sentences centering on ideas of improvement and learning:

[3.2] Forþon hit is gód godne to herianne 7 yfelne to leanne, þæt se geðeo  
se þe hit gehyre. Gif se oðer nolde, hu wurð he elles gelæred? (Miller  
2.10-12)<sup>150</sup>

The final clauses of [3.1b] then recast Bede’s modest disassociation from this moral motivation, which attributes the desire to see the text disseminated and its goals realised to its dedicatee, Ceolwulf, rather than to the author himself. In the translator’s version of these clauses, authority and intentions are explicit. The

---

<sup>149</sup> “I have confidence in your zeal, because you are very diligent and inquisitive as to the sayings and doings of men of old, and above all of the famous men among our people. For this book either speaks good of the good, and the hearer imitates that, or it speaks evil of the evil, and the hearer flees and shuns the evil. For it is good to praise the good and blame the bad, that the hearer may profit. If your hearer be reluctant, how else will he gain instruction? I have written this for your profit and for your people; as God chose you out to be king, in behoves you to instruct your people.” (Miller 3)

<sup>150</sup> “For it is good to praise the good and blame the bad, that the hearer may profit. If your hearer be reluctant, how else will he gain instruction?” (Miller 3)

translator cites his authorial presence directly (*ic*) in relation to particular motivations:

[3.3] For þinre **ðearfe** 7 for þinre ðeode ic þis awrat; forþon ðe God to cyninge geceas, þe **gedafenað** þine þeode to **læranne**. (Miller 2.12–15)<sup>151</sup>

In this brief statement of intent, key ideas found in the translator's added clauses in [3.2] above and promoted through doublings in the *Libellus*—instruction, improvement, and appropriate behaviour—are given particular prominence.

The *Libellus*, which has instruction on correct behaviour for both the newly converted people of England and the officers of their Church as its primary goal (Friesen 165), thus has an important role in achieving Bede's—and his translator's—moral agenda. Not only does the *Libellus* present clear guidelines for appropriate behaviour and management, it also offers an example of correct quality of consideration, compassion, and judgement in Gregory's approach to Augustine's questions. This approach can then be applied by the reader to questions not explicitly addressed, for the *Libellus* not only offers Gregory's instructions, but also includes his path towards those answers through scripture, Roman law, experience, and consideration of circumstances. The reader is thus provided with both direct and indirect advice on correct behaviour, and with the means to discern proper and improper judgement in others.

From its position in Bede's Latin *HE*, dominating the last half of Book I, the *Libellus* and its instructive content can influence the action (and the audience's reading of the action) of the four remaining books of the *HE*. Although Bede no doubt recognised the value of the *Libellus* to his didactic cause, there is no evidence within the *HE* that he positioned the text strategically with this in mind. Like each of the many other quoted documents Bede included in the *HE*, the *Libellus* appears in its chronological position, during the account of the mission led by Augustine

---

<sup>151</sup> "I have written this out for your profit and for your people; as God chose you out to be king, it behoves you to instruct your people." (Miller 3)

related in Book I. In the prefatory remarks which Bede attaches to his reproduction of the *Libellus*, Laurence and Peter, the supposed carriers of Augustine's questions, inform Gregory of the conversion of the English and Augustine's consecration as their archbishop. The pace and urgency of this preface preserve a sense of Augustine's uncertainty, and emphasise the freshness of the pagan faith in the minds of the newly converted:

Interea uir Domini Augustinus uenit Arelas, et ab archiepiscopo eiusdem ciuitatis Aetherio, iuxta quod iussa sancti patris Gregorii acceperant, archiepiscopus genti Anglorum ordinatus est; reuersusque Britanniam misit continuo Romam Laurentium presbyterum et Petrum monachum, qui beato pontifici Gregorio gentem Anglorum fidem Christi suscepisse ac se episcopum factum esse referrent, simul et de eis quae necessariae uidebantur quaestionibus eius consulta flagitans. Nec mora, congrua quaesitui responsa recepit, quae etiam huic historiae nostrae commodum duximus indere. (CM 79)<sup>152</sup>

Through its preface and position in the text, Bede situates the *Libellus* at the cusp between paganism and Christianity in the *HE*, polarising faithful and unfaithful to express ideas of Christian and unChristian behaviour at the most basic level. As Bill Friesen notes in his 2006 exploration of the role of the *Libellus* in early missionary activity, in its position in Book I of Bede's *HE* the text acts "as a bridge between the 'Christian city' and the 'pagan wilderness'" (Friesen 160). The particular historic and chronological circumstances surrounding the original *Libellus* dominate the audience's reading of the text in Bede's *HE*, overshadowing its value as an instructional tool of ongoing relevance.

---

<sup>152</sup> Meanwhile Augustine, the man of God, went to Arles and, in accordance with the command of the holy father Gregory, was consecrated archbishop of the English race by Etherius, the archbishop of that city. He returned to Britain and at once sent to Rome the priest Laurence and the monk Peter to inform the pope St. Gregory that the English race had received the faith of Christ and that he himself had been made their bishop. At the same time he asked his advice about certain questions which seemed urgent. He received fitting answers to his inquiry without delay, and we have thought proper to insert them in our history. (CM 79)

It is this value that the translator re-prioritises and exploits. By uplifting the *Libellus* from its chronological position and supporting material, the translator creates a 'floating' text which is divorced from its direct historical context. Where the general method used by the translator involves replacement of an excised text with a summary or the removal of the entire chapter containing it, at the point of removal of the *Libellus* text he appears to have taken particular care to ensure uninterrupted continuation of the narrative action (Rowley "Shifting Contexts" 85-86). The careful refashioning the translator applies to the original position of the *Libellus* in Book I allows the *Libellus* text to be applied to any context desired, rather than binding it to a specific interchange. This provides the translator with an opportunity to choose, through his positioning of the text, the context within the *HE* with which he wishes the messages contained in the *Libellus* to resonate.

The translator's handling of references to the *Libellus* elsewhere in the text further encourages this impression. Although the issues addressed in the *Libellus* text are continually raised throughout the *HE*, the *Interrogations* receive only two direct references, including one quotation, in chapters of the Latin text that the translator retains. Both of these references are deleted for the OE translation.

IV:XXVII closes with a quotation from *Interrogation* 1:

[3.4] Siquidem a temporibus ibidem antiquis et episcopus cum clero et abbas solebat manere cum monachis, qui tamen et ipsi ad curam episcopi familiariter pertinerent. Quia nimirum Aidan, qui primus eius loci episcopus fuit, cum monachis illuc et ipse monachus adueniens monachicam in eo conuersionem instituit; quomodo et prius beatus pater Augustinus in Cantia fecisse noscitur, scribente ei reuerentissimo papa Gregorio, quod et supra posuimus: 'Sed quia tua fraternitas' inquit 'monasterii regulis erudita seorsum fieri non debet a clericis suis, in ecclesia Anglorum, quae nuper auctore Deo ad fidem perducta est, hanc debet conuersionem instituere, quae initio nascentis ecclesiae fuit patribus nostris; in quibus

nullus eorum ex his quae possidebant aliquid suum esse dicebat, sed erant eis omnia communia.’ (CM 434.9-22)<sup>153</sup>

The quotation from the *Libellus* included in this passage replicates its source as found in Bede’s Latin text precisely, and is introduced as such through *quod et supra posuimus*. Bede’s OE translator removes the entire quoted passage, from ‘Sed quia tua fraternitas’ to ‘communia’, and also removes Bede’s introductory sentence to the quotation, which refers directly to Augustine and Gregory’s ‘answers’, thereby deleting any trace of the *Libellus* document from this point:

[3.4b] Forðon ða sylfan stowe þe se ilca árwyrða fæder Eata mid abbudes ánwalde heold 7 rehte—wæs ðær io on ealdum tíðum ge biscop mid his geferum, ge eac abbod wunode mid munecum. Hweðere hie to þæs biscopes scire heowesclíce belumpon. Forðon se halga Godes man Iodon, se ðe ærest ðære stowe biscop wæs, big munuchade, he ðider com mid munecum 7 munuclifes drohtunge he in ðæm mynstre gesette.

XXVIII (Miller 364.20-26)<sup>154</sup>

A second reference to the *Libellus* is deleted from II:I, which relates Gregory’s ‘life’ along with summaries of several other Gregorian works:

---

<sup>153</sup> “In fact in this monastery, even from ancient times, the bishop had been accustomed to live with his clergy and the abbot to live with the monks, who none the less belonged to the bishop’s household, because Aidan who was the first bishop of this place came as a monk and established monastic life there. This also, still earlier, the blessed Father Augustine is known to have done in Kent, when the most reverend Pope Gregory wrote to him as has been related above: ‘You, my brother, being conversant with monastic rules, ought not to live apart from your clergy in the English Church, which, by the guidance of God, has lately been converted to the faith; but you ought to institute that manner of life which our fathers followed in the earliest beginning of the Church: none of them said that anything he possessed was his own but they had all things in common.’” (CM 435)

<sup>154</sup> “For in the same place where this venerable father Eata ruled and directed with the power of abbot, there was there formerly in old times both a bishop with his clergy and also an abbot dwelling with the monks. However these fell to the charge of the bishop as part of his household. For the holy man of God, Aidan, who first was bishop of that place, being himself a monk, came there with monks and established the mode of monastic life in the monastery. XXIX” (Miller 365)

[3.5] ... excepto libello Responsionum, quem ad interrogationes sancti Augustini primi Anglorum gentis episcopi scripsit, ut et supra docuimus, totum ipsum libellum his inserentes historiis; ... (CM 128.9-12)<sup>155</sup>

Although this second reference shows little of the deliberation evident in the first (very precise and particular) deletion, a cursory examination of the translator's handling of references to other deleted texts reveals a defined methodology.

The translator customarily deletes documents which Bede quotes from other sources, a factor which makes his decision to retain the *Libellus* especially interesting, and the excision of a direct quotation here unsurprising. In the context of the HE as a complete text, however, the passage quoted above is not only a direct quotation, but is also a cross reference. As Whitelock noted in "The Old English Bede", the translator's extreme care to remove text entirely, including references to that text elsewhere in the HE, is a key feature of his deletion methodology. The general precision evident in the translator's approach to the editing of his source does not support a theory of deletion of the *Libellus* text, followed by a change of heart and reinsertion of the text after the translation was complete. Rather, the translator's careful removal of references to the *Libellus* in the HE narrative may be designed to maintain the text's freedom from association with historical context.

Rather than adopting Bede's historiographical philosophy, with its conscientious chronology and referencing, the translator passes over such concerns in order to impose his own strategy for the *Libellus*. Part of this strategy may be revealed in the relationship between the *Libellus* and other texts to survive the translator's excision process. Although it forms part of the correspondence between Augustine and Gregory which Bede includes in Book I, the *Libellus* cannot be categorised in the same way as the other correspondence deleted from the HE. Essentially, the *Libellus* comprises a *regula*, initiated by Augustine in Britain and

---

<sup>155</sup> "not to mention the book of answers to the questions of St. Augustine, the first bishop of the English race, which I have described above and of which the whole is included in this *History*." (CM 129)

pertaining directly to internal Church affairs in the English Church, and forms a text of its own. The *Libellus* as such has more in common with other English church documents (such as synodal decisions) comprising guidelines for the operation of the Church.

Two such synodal books are retained for the translation, located in Book IV at chapters V and XVII in the Latin version and at chapters V-VI and XIX in the translator's version (the final chapter of the proceedings at IV:V spills over to form IV:VI in the Old English text). The inclusion of these two documents demonstrates the translator's reasoning in choosing which of Bede's many quoted documents to retain in his version.<sup>156</sup> These surviving documents pertain to the administration of the English church (Discenza 78), and are intended to enforce and strengthen correct operation, administration, and personal conduct of both congregation and clergy. The translator's placement of the *Libellus* between Books Three and Four thus increases its proximity to other similar texts of Church governance, and clusters these texts in and around the earlier stages of Book IV.

An examination of the new surrounding context of the OE *Libellus*, however, reveals that a desire to place like documents in relatively close proximity in the text may not be the translator's only reason for moving the *Libellus*. In chapter 2, selected 'doublings' from the translator's version of the *Interrogations* were examined in relation to the concept of *consideratio* as a vehicle towards an ideal Christian lifestyle. This limited study suggested that the translator's doublings form a network of emphases and insertions which augment Gregory's *consideratio*, a conscious balancing of spiritual and material concerns based around reflection and considered judgement or decision-making accompanied by necessary correction. In the *Libellus*, balanced consideration and judgement permeates every 'answer', forming the core of Gregory's ideal approach for Augustine to establish and maintain the

---

<sup>156</sup> Only one other quoted document, Gregory's epitaph at II:I, is transferred from Bede's *HE* into the translator's version.



Church in England. Through his doublings, the translator heightens the presence of these ideas within the *Libellus*, reinforcing the concept of and journey towards ideal behavioural modes through moral and behavioural correction. As such, the doublings found in the *Interrogations* provide us with a window into the translator's authorial strategy for the text.

Each doubling represents a manipulation of Bede's vocabulary, and thus also manipulates the expression of ideas within the text. The vocabulary studies carried out for the previous chapter isolated a sample, consisting of 35 Latin nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs with a total of 403 translated occurrences, which reflects ideas to which the translator has paid particular attention. Tabular analysis of the placement of each of these occurrences over the entire *HE* reveals concentration of vocabulary expressing these ideas in particular books of the text:

TABLE 2: *Distribution of Amended Vocabulary Sample*

	INT	PREF	BOOK 1	BOOK 2	BOOK 3	BOOK 4	BOOK 5	TOTAL
abstineo	7			1		1	1	2
accendo	1			3	2	6	1	11
adfligo			1		2	1		4
consuetudo	9			1	3	2	1	6
conversatio	1		1		3	5	4	9
conversor	2					3	1	6
corrigo	6			1	4	3	3	17
defleo	1							1
deliberatio	1							1
dicto	1				1	1	1	4
disciplina	2				6	12	4	24
district(i)us	2					2		4
doceo	2		2	6	12	15	10	47
erudio	2				4	3	2	11
expono	1				1	4	1	7
ferio	2		1			1		4
furor	1		1	2				4
gemo	2		1					3
ingemisco	1							1
insequor	1		1		1			3
lavacrum	2		1	4	5	2		14
lavo	7				4	4	1	16
nosco	3	1	2	2	9	17	15	49
mens	14		3	7	5	14	5	48
penso	4							4
perduco			1	2	1	6	8	18
placet	2			1	4	7	2	16
poena	1		2		3	6	2	14
polluo	3			3	1			7
praecipuus	2		2				1	5
privo	4			2	1		1	8
prohibeo	13		2		2	5	2	24
prohibitio	1							1
sub(i)icio	1			2	2	1		6
subiungo	2					2		4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>403</b>

The time- and size- constraints of this study prevent more detailed analysis of a larger sample, and the findings presented in “Table 2” must remain imprecise to an extent. Nevertheless, this breakdown of select vocabulary placement demonstrates a concentration of recurrences of vocabulary altered (or given special attention by) the translator within the *Libellus* into the later three books of the *HE*. Such a concentration suggests that the ideas expressed through this vocabulary, particularly those identified in Chapter 2 (consideration and learning; purity, impurity, and cleansing; lifestyle or behaviour; social identity and behavioural expectations; penance, discipline and correction; prohibition; and prayer), are more prevalent in the final three books of the work than in any other.

### *The ‘Clean Lifestyle’ of the Libellus within Books III-V of the HE*

#### *Cleansing and Sacred Spaces*

Key ideas behind the most penitentially loaded of the *Interrogations*, *Interrogations* 8 and 9 (namely bodily and spiritual purity and access to sacred space), are represented particularly in Books Three and Four. The previous chapter noted frequent repetition in *Interrogation* 8 of concepts expressed through the Latin *lavo* and *lavacrum*—cleansing and the resulting cleanliness or purity. Seven of the nine occurrences of *lavo* or *lavacrum* found in the *Libellus* appear in *Interrogation* 8, four of which are replaced with doublings.<sup>157</sup> The translator doubles only one of the twenty-three translated instances in the *HE* narrative, replacing *laverunt* (CM 396.13) with *þwogon 7 baðodon* (Miller 322.32) in IV:XIX. This chapter, in which *lavo* receives a total of three repetitions, relates the life and death of Bede’s most revered female saint, Æðelþryð. Bodily cleanliness, invoked through images of washing and sexual abstinence, is a particular feature of Æðelþryð’s character in Bede’s relatively short chapter containing her portrait (110 lines in Colgrave and Mynors’ edition):

---

<sup>157</sup> The translator includes all sixteen occurrences of *lavo* found in the Latin text, and retains fourteen of Bede’s sixteen uses of *lavacrum* (see Appendix B).

[3.6] Nam etiam signum diuini miraculi, quo eiusdem feminae sepulta caro corrumpi non potuit, indicio est quia a uirili contactu incorrupta durauerit. (CM 392.7-9)<sup>158</sup>

[3.7] De qua ferunt quia, ex quo monasterium petiit, nunquam lineis sed solum laneis uestimentis uti uoluerit, raroque in calidis balneis praeter imminentibus sollemniis maioribus, uerbi gratia paschae pentecostes epiphaniae, **lauari** uoluerit, et tunc nouissima omnium, **lotis** prius suo suarumque ministrarum obsequio ceteris quae ibi essent famulis Christi; ... (CM 392.18-24)<sup>159</sup>

Here abstinence is directly correlated with purity, enabling Æðelþryð to retain bodily cleanliness without washing, thus denying the body and worldly concerns in favour of a clean spiritual life (Karkov 400).

The cleansing suggested by Bede's use of *lavo* in each of the cases found in *Interrogation 8* is demanded as a condition for entrance to the sacred space of the Church, specifically after sexual intercourse:

[3.8] Vir autem cum propria coniuge dormiens, nisi **lotus** aqua, intrare ecclesiam non debet; sed neque **lotus** intrare statim debet. Lex autem ueteri populo praecepit, ut mixtus uir mulieri et **lauari** aqua debeat et ante solis occasum ecclesiam non intrare (quod tamen intelligi spiritaliter potest, quia mulieri uir miscetur quando illicitae concupiscentiae animus in cogitatione per delectationem coniungitur), quia, nisi prius ignis concupiscentiae a mente deferueat, dignum se congregationi fratrum aestimare non debet, qui se grauari per nequitiam prauae uoluntatis uidet. Quamuis de hac re diuersae hominum nationes diuersa sentiant atque alia custodire uideantur, Romanorum tamen semper ab antiquioribus usus fuit,

---

<sup>158</sup> "And the divine miracle whereby her flesh would not corrupt after she was buried was token and proof that she had remained uncorrupted by contact with any man." (CM 393)

<sup>159</sup> "It is related of her that, from the time she entered the monastery, she would never wear linen but only woollen garments and would seldom take a hot bath except just before the greater feasts, such as Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany, and then last of all, after the other handmaidens of Christ who were present had washed themselves, assisted by herself and her attendants." (CM 393)

post ammixtionem propriae coniugis et **lauacri** purificationem quaerere et  
ab ingressu ecclesiae paululum reuerentur abstinere. (CM 94.22-34)<sup>160</sup>

The translator enhances the demand for purity in his translation of the above  
passage, doubling all but one of Bede's uses of *lavo*:

[3.8b] Se wer, se þe mid his ágene wiife bið slæpende, nemne he mid wætre  
**aþwegen 7 bibaðod** sy, ne sceal he in circan gongan, ne, þeah þe he  
**bibaðod** si, sona mot ingongan. Forþon seo æ bibeað þæm aldan Godes  
folce, þæt se wer, se ðe wære his wiife gemenged, þæt he sceolde wætre  
**aðwegen 7 bebaðad** beon, 7 ær sunnan setlgonge ne moste in heora  
gesomnunge ingongan. Ðæt hwæðre mæg gastlice ongyten beon; forþon  
wer bið wiife gemenged, þonne unalyfedre willunge monnes mood in  
geþohte þurh lustfulnesse bið geþeoded. Forþon, nemne ær þæt fyr þære  
unrehtan willunge from þam mode acolie, ne sceal he hine wyrðne telgan  
broðra 7 Godes þeowa gesomnunge, se ðe hine gesið hefigadne beon þurh  
yfelnesse unrehtes willan. Ðeah þe bi þisse wisan missenleco cynn monna  
missenlice ongete 7 halde, hwæðre symble wæs Romana gewuna from heora  
yldrum æfter gemængnisse agenes wiifes, þæt heo clæsnunge **bæðes 7**

---

<sup>160</sup> "A man who has had intercourse with his wife ought not to enter the church unless he has washed himself; and even when washed he ought not to enter immediately. Now the law commanded the ancient people that when a man had intercourse with a woman he ought to wash himself and should not enter the church before sunset; but this can be explained in a spiritual sense. A man has intercourse with a woman when his mind is united with her in thought in the delights of illicit concupiscence, so unless the fire of concupiscence is first quenched in his mind he should not consider himself worthy of the company of his brethren while he sees himself burdened by the sinfulness of depraved desire. Although different nations think differently in this matter and appear to observe different rules, yet it has always been the custom of the Romans from ancient times, after intercourse with one's own wife to seek purification by washing and reverently to abstain from entering the church for a brief period." (CM 95)

pweales sohton, 7 from cirican ingonge hwylchwugu fæc arwyrðlice  
áhabban. (Miller 80.22-82.3)<sup>161</sup>

The concept of purity is extended again in additions to closing passages of

*Interrogation 8:*

[3.9] Vigilanti uero mente pensandum est, quod in Sina monte Dominus ad  
populum locuturus prius eundem populum abstinere a mulieribus praecepit.  
(CM 96.35-98.2)<sup>162</sup>

[3.9b] Mid wæccre moode is to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne, þæt, þa he  
Drihten wolde his folc gesprecende beon in Sinai dune, he þa ærest bebed,  
þæt heo heora hrægl woosce 7 clænsode 7 heo from wiifum ahæfde.  
(Miller 84.2-5)<sup>163</sup>

The translator's addition to this passage, a demand for cleansing of garments before  
coming before the Lord on Mount Sinai, replaces an excluded portion of the biblical  
passage which Gregory draws on here:

[3.10] <sup>14</sup> Descenditque Moyses de monte ad populum, et sanctificavit eum.  
Cumque lavissent vestimenta sua, <sup>15</sup> ait ad eos : Estote parati in diem

---

<sup>161</sup> The man, when he is sleeping with his own wife, unless he is bathed and washed with water, he shall not go into the church, nor, when he is washed, may go in immediately. Because the law asked that of the old people of God, that the man, when he was joined with his wife, that he should be washed and bathed with water, and must not go into their assembly before sunset. That nevertheless may be perceived spiritually; because a man is joined with his wife, when unlawful desire is associated in the mind of a man with thought through lustfulness. Therefore, unless before that fire the incorrect desire is cooled from the mind, he shall not count him worthy of the brothers and of God's servants, when he sees himself heavy through the evilness of incorrect desire. Though about this matter in various races of men (there are) various understandings and observances, nevertheless it was always the custom of the Romans from their elders after joining their wives, that they sought cleansing of bathing and washing, and reverently abstained from going into the church for some time.

<sup>162</sup> "It should be considered carefully that when the Lord was about to speak to the people from Mount Sinai he first commanded them to abstain from women." (CM 97, 99)

<sup>163</sup> With watchful mind is to be meditated on and to be considered, that, when the Lord would speak to his people on Mount Sinai, he then commanded first, that they wash and cleanse their garments and they abstain from women.

tertium, et ne appropinquetis uxoribus vestris. (*Vulgata Clementina* Ex. 19:14-15)<sup>164</sup>

The translator thus restores the concept of bodily cleanliness into Gregory's closing scriptural analogy. This extension maintains a continuous association between bodily cleanliness or washing and entrance into the Lord's presence in the Church, culminating in the final ruling:

[3.11] Tunc autem uir, qui post ammixtionem coniugis **lotus aqua** fuerit, etiam sacrae communionis mysterium ualet accipere, cum ei iuxta praefinitam sententiam etiam ecclesiam licuerit intrare. (CM 98.11-14)<sup>165</sup>

[3.11b] Þonne se wer, se ðe æfter his wiifes gemengnisse **wætre aþwegen** 7 **bibaðod** bið, he mot þam geryne onfón þære halgan gemænsumnesse, mid þy him eac alyfed bið, swa we ær cwædon, in cirican gongan. (Miller 84.16-20)<sup>166</sup>

Each of the five doubled replacements for *lavo* in these passages, all of which occur within the final sixty-seven line section of the OE *Interrogation* 8's 176 lines (Miller 80-84), demonstrate special attention to this concept during the translation of *Interrogation* 8. In particular, the translator's restoration of *lavissent vestimenta sua* to [3.9] reveals a particular interest in this cleanliness in its suggestion of 'further reading' of the invoked scriptural passage for the translation, and relates cleansing once again to access to sacred space.

Indeed, the great amount of time *Æðelþryð* spends in the sacred space of the Church in IV:XIX is another particular feature of her character, presented in close proximity to the image of cleansing in extract 3.7:

---

<sup>164</sup> "14 And Moses came down from the mount to the people, and sanctified them. And when they had washed their garments, <sup>15</sup>He said to them: Be ready against the third day, and come not near your wives." (Douay-Rheims)

<sup>165</sup> "A man then who, after intercourse with his wife, has washed, is able to receive the mystery of the Holy Communion, since it is lawful for him, according to what has been said, to enter the church." (CM 99)

<sup>166</sup> Then the man, who after joining his wife is washed and bathed with water, he may receive the mystery of the holy communion, when he is also allowed, as we said before, to go into the church.

[3.12] semper, si non infirmitas grauior prohibuisset, ex tempore matutinae synaxeos usque ad ortum diei in ecclesia precibus intenta persteterit. (CM 392.26-29)<sup>167</sup>

Such proximity again forces association between cleanliness and entrance into sacred space, an association reinforced later as Æðelþryð's exhumed body is washed (*lavetur* CM 396.13; *þwogon 7 baðodon* Miller 322.32) before being carried into the Church for reburial.

Elsewhere, bodily and spiritual impurity, excluded from the church in *Interrogation* 8, is depicted as being either cleansed or expunged from other sacred spaces in the text. III:XI, for example, depicts the introduction of spiritual impurity into the sacred space of a monastic enclosure through a 'guest' (*hospes* CM 248.8; *cuma* Miller 184.21). This 'guest' is infected with a spiritual impurity that disturbs his sleep and the peace of Æðelhild's monastery:

[3.13] Transacto autem tempore aliquanto, cum esset in suo monasterio, uenit illic quidam hospes qui solebat nocturnis saepius horis repente ab inmundo spiritu grauissime uexari. Qui cum benigne susceptus post caenam in lecto membra posuisset, subito a diabolo arreptus clamare, dentibus frendere, spumare et diuersis motibus coepit membra torquere; cumque a nullo uel teneri uel ligari potuisset, cucurrit minister et pulsans ad ostium nuntiauit abbatissae. (CM 248.7-14)<sup>168</sup>

The abbess and her escort, called from the women's house of the monastery to help calm the 'guest', arrive to find a crowd (of men) actively attempting to hold the man, writhing with 'seizures', still. The priest attempts exorcisms (*exorcismos*, CM 248; *orationem ... þa ðe wið þære aðle awritene wéron*, Miller 184) to no avail, until finally

---

<sup>167</sup> "she always remained in the church at prayer from the time of the office of mattins until dawn, unless prevented by serious illness." (CM 393)

<sup>168</sup> "Some time afterwards, when she was in her monastery, there came a guest who used very often to be greatly troubled in the night, without warning, by an unclean spirit. This guest was hospitably received and, after supper, had lain down on his bed, when he was suddenly possessed by the devil and began to gnash his teeth and foam at the mouth, while his limbs were twisted by convulsive movements. As he could neither be held down nor bound, a servant ran and knocked at the abbess's gate and told her." (CM 249)



the abbess remembers the soil she had received from Queen Osðryð (CM 244-248; Miller 182-4), and which had been taken from the floor onto which the water used to clean the bones of St. Oswald was poured. When this soil is brought into the ‘possessed’ guest’s space, he suddenly becomes still:

[3.14] .... conticuit ille subito, et quasi in somnum laxatus deposuit caput, membra in quietem omnia composuit. ‘Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant,’ quem res exitum haberet solliciti exspectantes ... (CM 248.25-28)<sup>169</sup>

[3.14b] ... þa geswigade he semninga 7 his heafod onhyldde, swa swa he slapan wolde, 7 his leomu in stilnesse gesette. þa swigodon heo eac ealle 7 stille wæron; 7 sorgiende bidon to hwon his þing weorðan scolde. (Miller 186.6-9)<sup>170</sup>

Following this miraculous ‘calming’, the scene is saturated in images of stillness and silence, echoing the atmosphere of quiet and mystery within the church depicted in *Æðelþryð*’s episode.

Bede characterises *Æðelhild*’s visitor as neither a monk nor a lay-person, but as *hospes* (‘guest’), further defining him through his association with the ‘unclean spirit’ that comes into the monastery with him. The translator here uses *cuma* —‘stranger’ or ‘guest’—implying, through *cuman* (‘to come, approach, get to’), an introduction from outside. This choice underlines movement to or into the monastery from elsewhere, emphasising the separateness of the sacred enclosure and the ‘otherness’ of the new ‘comer’, representing the external area and culture. Once within the monastery, the ‘stranger’s’ ‘uncleanliness’ is removed as the impurity implied by his coming from outside and his association with the ‘unclean’ are effectively purified by the miracle that the abbess performs. The miracle that expels

---

<sup>169</sup> “he was suddenly silent and laid his head down as if he were relaxed in sleep, while his limbs became quiet and composed. ‘Hushed were they all and, fixed in silence, gazed’, waiting anxiously to see how it would all end.” (CM 249)

<sup>170</sup> “he suddenly became silent and dropped his head, as though he would sleep, and composed his limbs to rest. Then all were silent and still, and awaited the result with apprehension.” (Miller 187)

the 'unclean spirit' from the guest, and the use of dirt from a mortuary floor to cleanse, demonstrate the ability of God, and devotion to God, to purify the unclean and make the lowest of things sacred. The scene of the miracle contrasts the figures of the cleansed abbess and saint, represented by the purified dirt, with the impure 'spirit' troubling the guest and thus with the impurity of the guest himself. The emphasis of the Old English translator on the alien nature of this guest—on his coming from outside, being therefore either a member of secular society or having necessarily passed through it—highlights a connection between secularity and impurity, and their juxtaposition against the monastic or ecclesiastic and pure.

Described as a manifestation of a devil (*diablo* CM 248.11; *deofle* Miller 184.24), later confirmed as *the* Devil by its characterisation as 'the ancient foe' in the Latin text (*antiquo hoste* CM 250.2), the seizure of the 'guest' creates a contention between the Holy and the temptations which lead the righteous into sin, and off the path towards the ideal clean Christian lifestyle. The translator seems to downplay this representation, characterising a common devil or demon by including the demonic visitant among the *awyrgedan gastas* (Miller 186.19), 'abominable spirits', described at the closing of the passage in place of *antiquo hoste*—'ancient enemy'. By characterising the possessor as the 'ancient foe', the Devil, Bede creates the miracle story to show the triumph of Christian faith over temptation and the greatest evil. The translator, on the other hand, creates a representation of common temptation, bringing the impurity of the 'guest' closer to the impurities encountered in everyday life.

The impurity of the 'spirit' and the guest is described in the Latin using *inmundo* (CM 248.9), with a medieval association not only with the unclean but also with shame, guilt, and 'worldliness' (Latham, 235), affirming the connection between the guest's impurity and secular life. The translator's '*úncleenum gaste*' (Miller 184.22) has similar implications, and echoes uses in *Interrogation* 8. Here, *úncleene* forms part of doubled translations for *immundus* (CM 94.8; Miller

80.8) and *pollutus* (CM 94.14; Miller 80.14), explaining pollution of the ‘mind and spirit’, in the context of the secular activities of marriage and procreation. An earlier use of the phrase in II:V describes the visitations of *unclenan gastes* as *brycced*—attacks—and as heavenly discipline for a *treowleasan cyninge* (Miller 110.30), while a later use shows the *unclenan gastas* as challengers to the ‘righteous’ (Miller 214.15–17), dragging them into the fire of ‘unlawful desire’ (Miller 214.6–12). Other episodes containing occurrences of *unclæne* and its associates translate transgressives such as *incestus*, again describing activities associated with sin and the outside, secular world, and describe sexual abstinence or virginity (avoidance of ‘*unclænnesse*’), which bring the subject closer to God.

Sexuality is perhaps the foremost divider between the religious and lay worlds; bodily and spiritual purity stems from a lack of knowledge and contact with the ‘worldly’ affairs of secular life—sexual activity being chief among these—in favour of an immersion in the spiritual. Sacred space—whether church or monastic enclosure—thus needs to remain unpolluted by the ‘outside’ world and ‘worldly’ concerns, both physically and behaviourally. The eradication of pollution from Æðelhild’s monastery (through cleansing of the ‘guest’) associated with the water used to bathe the bones of Oswald, invokes the cleansing process performed during this washing ritual:

[3.15] *Lota igitur ossa intulerunt in thecam, quam in hoc praeparauerant, atque in ecclesia iuxta honorem congruum posuerunt; et ut regia uiri sancti persona memoriam haberet aeternam, uexillum eius super tumbam auro et purpura conpositum adposuerunt, ipsamque aquam, in qua lauerant ossa, in angulo sacrarii fuderunt. Ex quo tempore factum est, ut ipsa terra, quae lauacrum uenerabile suscepit, ad abigendos ex obsessis corporibus daemones gratiae salutaris haberet effectum. (CM 246.21–29)<sup>171</sup>*

---

<sup>171</sup> “The bones were washed, laid in a shrine constructed for the purpose, and placed in the church with fitting honours; and in order that the royal saint might be perpetually remembered, they placed above the tomb his banner of gold and purple, pouring out the water in which the bones had been washed in a corner of the sanctuary. Ever afterwards the soil which had received that holy water had the power and saving grace of driving devils from the bodies of people possessed.” (CM 247)

[3.15b] Ond heo þa ða baán onþwógon 7 in cyste gedydon 7 in cirican  
 æfter gerisenre aare gesetton. Ond þætte se cynelica had þæs halgan weres  
 ece gemynd hæfde, his segen, se wæs mid golde 7 mid godwebbe gefrætwad,  
 7 ofer his byrgenne geseted. Ond þæt seolf wæter, þæt heo þa báán mid  
 þwógon, guton in ænne ende þære cirican. Of þære tide wæs geworden,  
 þætte seo seolf eorðe, þe þæt arwyrðe bæð onfeng, meahte to hælo  
 feondseocra monna 7 oðerra untrymnessa. (Miller 182.31-184.6)<sup>172</sup>

Following his contact with the ‘bathed’ soil, the impurity of the guest is neutralised and a calm, static atmosphere (associated with pure sacred space in *Æðelþryð*’s narrative) is reinstated. With the ‘unclean’ influence accompanying the ‘guest’ eradicated, the sacred space of the monastery is once more free of pollution from the world outside.

The silent, static environment of *Æðelhild*’s cleansed monastery is echoed in the depiction of the ‘clean’ *Æðelþryð* at prayer. In describing the daily activities of this abbess, Bede builds up a collection of ‘never’, ‘seldom’, and ‘rarely’ negatively qualified activities before rounding off the catalogue with one positively qualified action: she ‘always remained in the church at prayer from the time of the office of mattins until dawn’. These images show a build up of active ritual behaviours—wearing, washing, eating—contrasted with a stationary activity—prayer—in which the performer’s body remains immobile, but the mind is very active. To add to the resonance of this imagery, the abbess remains at prayer in the church throughout the night, a time of darkness often associated with death. Furthermore, no candle (or any form of lighting) is described as being in the church with *Æðelþryð* during this time. We must assume that she spent these hours completely still, in complete darkness, echoing the static, expectant stillness of *Æðelhild*’s monastery following the cleansing of her ‘guest’, and the ‘sobriety’ and attention to contemplative worship

---

<sup>172</sup> “Then they washed the bones, and putting them in a chest, deposited them in the church with due honour. And that the royal rank of this holy man might be kept in perpetual remembrance, his ensign, adorned with gold and purple, was placed above his tomb. And the water, in which the bones were washed, was poured out at one end of the church. From that time on the earth, which received this holy water, had power to heal demoniacs and other infirmities.” (Miller 183, 185)

invoked in association with Timothy's epistle ([2.12]) in *Interrogation* 1 (extract 2.16/2.16b).

This discourse of sacred space as still and contemplative, with a prerequisite of bodily and spiritual cleanliness, is given further depth through the narrative of the monastery at Coldingham, from which impurity is expunged in IV:XXV (XXVI). Coldingham, although it is shown to have a prestigious history in the *HE*, provides a background for the degradation and dissolution of correct monastic observance in a women's, or, perhaps equally or more importantly, a double, house. When a spiritual visitor finds the inmates neglecting prayer and contemplation in favour of 'sinful' activities, the monastery and its community are destroyed by fire (CM 420-27; Miller 348-57). Like Æðelhild's miracle in III:XI, this fire effectively cleanses pollution from the sacred space of the monastery.

At the opening of the chapter, Bede tells us that the monastery was 'consumed by fire through the fault of carelessness' (*per culpam incuriae flammis absumtum est* CM 420.28-30; *þurb ungemænne synne fyre 7 lege wæs fornumen* Miller 348.28-29). Bede's qualifying addendum refutes this claim with an alternative reasoning according to the common view:

[3.16] Quod tamen a malitia inhabitantium in eo, et praecipue illorum qui maiores esse uidebantur, contigisse omnes qui nouere facillime potuerunt aduertere. (CM 420.30-32)<sup>173</sup>

[3.16b] Ðæt hwæðre æðelice ongetan meahton ealle þa þæt cuðon, þætte þæt gelomp for wean 7 for yfelnesse þara eardiendra þær in þære byrig, ond þara swiþust þe ðær aldormen wæran. (Miller 348.29-31)<sup>174</sup>

In the translation, Bede's *a malitia inhabitantium* becomes *for wean ond for yfelnesse þara eardiendra þær in þære byrig*—"because of the wickedness and the evilness of

---

<sup>173</sup> "However, all who knew the truth were easily able to judge that it happened because of the wickedness of those who dwelt there and especially of those who were supposed to be its leaders." (CM 421)

<sup>174</sup> "However all, who knew the matter, could easily see, that this befell owing to the wickedness and evil life of those who dwelt in that town, and above all of those who were the chief persons there." (Miller 349)

those who dwelled there in that town” (Miller 348.29-31). The classification of Coldingham as a *byrig* effectively gives the place a closer association with secular life, fore-grounding the contact with the outside world described later as one of the monastery inmates’ faults.

The introductory passages of the chapter thus depict the monastery as spiritually corrupt, and having been duly punished. The opening passage, however, also states that this punishment could have been avoided. Previous warning gave those at fault ample time to mend their ways:

[3.17] Sed non defuit puniendis admonitio diuinae pietatis, qua correcti per ieiunia fletus et preces iram a se instar Nineuitarum iusti Iudicis auerterent. (CM 420.32-422.2)<sup>175</sup>

[3.17b] Ac him hwæðre won ne wæs seo monung þær godcundan ærfæstnesse, þæt heo heora synne witnade 7 bette þurh fæsten, þurh wópas, þurh gebedo, ond corre from him acyrde þæs soðfæsten deman, in þa onlicnesse Niniuinwearena. (Miller 348.31-350.)<sup>176</sup>

The declaration of the fate of the monastery—destruction by fire—in the primary sentence of the chapter, alerts the reader to the fact that the purification through fasting and prayer required to avert such judgement was not carried out. Such a scenario of cause and avoidable effect, established at the opening of the narrative, initiates a continual reflection on potential for redemption of impure behaviour, encouraging the reader to take advantage of opportunities to correct their own faults.

### *Behavioural Purity*

The story of Adamnan, erstwhile resident of Coldingham, which underlies the chapter provides a direct contrast to the failure of the Coldingham inhabitants to

---

<sup>175</sup> “But God in His mercy did not fail to give warning of approaching punishment so that they might have been led to amend their ways and, by fasting, tears, and prayers, to have averted the wrath of the just Judge from themselves as did the people of Nineveh.” (CM 421-423)

<sup>176</sup> “And yet there was no lack of warning from the divine goodness, that they should chastise and correct their sins by fasting, tears, and prayer, and that they should turn from them the wrath of the true judge in the manner of the people of Nineveh.” (Miller 351)

observe correct behaviour (and rectify incorrect behaviour). Adamnan, after remembering a grievous sin of his youth, seeks the advice of priest in order to rectify the resulting spiritual impurity and regain the path to salvation. The priest prescribes 'fastings, psalmody, and prayer' (*ieiuniis psalmis et orationibus* CM 422.17-18; *fastenum ond sealm songum ond gebeodum* Miller 350.21-22), an echo of *Interrogation* 1's 'good habits' (extract 2.16/2.16b), which are observed diligently for an extended period (Miller 352.2-4). The synopsis of Adamnan's attempts to atone for the sins of his life closes with the implication that his efforts met with success, as he ceases to need to observe the routine to ensure his salvation, but continues his observance 'for love of God and because he delighted in its rewards' (CM 424.4-6; Miller 352.12-14).

Adamnan's behaviour and its opposite, that of the Coldingham inhabitants, thus not only recall the connection between purity and sacred space emphasised in *Interrogation* 8, but also the behavioural expectations entailed in living *godum þeawum* established in *Interrogation* 1:

[2.15b] ... þæt heo godum þeawum lifgen under ciriclecum regole 7 sealmas to singenne 7 wæccan to bigongenne, 7 from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden. (Miller 66.4-7)<sup>177</sup>

The inhabitants of Coldingham, rather than living *under ciriclecum regole* with clean hearts, tongues, and bodies, indulge in material pleasures at the expense of religious observance. This behaviour is directly juxtaposed with correct observance, particularly through Adamnan's report to the abbess Æbbe. Adamnan relates the visitation of a 'stranger' (*quendam incogniti uultus* CM 424.19-20; *sumne monnan uncupes ond wleotan* Miller 354.2-3) while he is occupied with vigils and psalm singing during the night (*Nuper occupatus noctu vigiliis et psalmis* CM 424.18-19; *It*

---

<sup>177</sup> ... that they live as God's servants under church rule and sing psalms and observe vigils, and they hold their hearts and tongues and bodies clean from everything unfaithful for almighty God.

*wæs ungeara on neaht abisgad on weacenum 7 on sealmsonge 7 on gebedum* Miller

354.1-2), to alert him to the degenerate behaviour of others in the monastery:

[3.18] Siquidem modo totum hoc monasterium ex ordine perlustrans, singulorum casas ac lectos inspexi, et neminem ex omnibus praeter te erga sanitatem animae suae occupatum repperi; sed omnes prorsus, et uiri et feminae, aut somno torpent inertes aut ad peccata uigilant. Nam et domunculae, quae ad orandum vel legendum factae erant, nunc in comesationum, potationum, fabulationum et ceterarum sunt inlecebrarum cubilia conuersae; uirgines quoque Deo dicatae, contempta reuerentia suae professionis, quotiescumque uacant, texendis subtilioribus indumentis operam dant, quibus aut se ipsas ad uicem sponsarum in periculum sui status adornent, aut externorum sibi uirorum amicitiam conparent. Vnde merito loco huic et habitatoribus eius grauis de caelo uindicta flammis saeuientibus praeparata est. (CM 424.32-426.4)<sup>178</sup>

[3.18b] Soð ic secge, þæt ic nu eal þis mynster ðurh endebyrdnisse geondferde 7 syndrigra hús 7 bedd geseah: 7 nænigne of eallum butan þe ic gemette ymb his saule hælo abisgodne beon; ah alle ge wæpnedmenn ge wifmenn oððo hefige slæpe syndon, oððe to synnum wacedon. Ond ða hus ða ðe in to gebiddenne 7 to leornienne geworhte wæron, ða syndon nu in hús gehwerfed oferæta 7 druncennesse 7 leasspellunge 7 oðerra unalefedlecra scylda. 7 eac swelce ða fæmnan, ða ðe Gode gehalgode wæron, forhogdre are heara ondetnisse, ond swa oft swa hio æmtan habbað, þæt hio smaelo hrægel weofað 7 wyrcað, mid ðæm hio oððo hio siolfe frætwað in bryda onlicnesse, in frecenesse hiora stalles oððo utwæpnedmonna friondscipes

---

<sup>178</sup> “I have just visited every part of the monastery in turn: I have examined their cells and their beds, and I have found no one except you concerned with his soul’s welfare; but all of them, men and women alike, are sunk in slothful slumbers or else they remain awake for the purposes of sin. And the cells that were built for praying and for reading have become haunts of feasting, drinking, gossip, and other delights; even the virgins who are dedicated to God put aside all respect for their profession and, whenever they have leisure, spend their time weaving elaborate garments with which to adorn themselves as if they were brides, so imperilling their virginity, or else to make friends with strange men. So it is only right that a heavy vengeance from heaven should be preparing for this place and for its inhabitants in the form of a raging fire.” (CM 425-427)



him ceapiað. Forðon bi gewyrhte þysse stowe 7 hire eardiendum hefig wræc  
of hiofenum grimsiendum legum is gegearwad. (Miller 354.17-27)<sup>179</sup>

Here Adamnan's clean lifestyle, enhanced in the translation through addition of 'prayer' (*IC wæs ungeara on neaht abisgad on weacenum 7 on sealmsonge 7 on gebedum* ...), juxtaposes the unclean habits of the other Coldingham inhabitants who, although warned, "returned to their old defilement and committed even worse crimes" (*redierunt ad pristinas sordes, immo sceleratiora fecerunt* CM 426.10-11, 427).

The behaviours of 'prayer and study' (*orandum vel legendum* CM 424.34; *to gebiddenne 7 to leornienne* Miller 354.29), for which the monastery was built (*factae* CM 424.34; *geworhte* Miller 354.29), construct an ideal of contemplation and stillness within the monastery's spaces reminiscent of the stillness and silence of pure sacred space depicted in the episodes of *Æðelþryð* and *Æðelhild*. The behaviours with which 'prayer and study' are replaced in the Coldingham narrative, however, are active, secular pursuits:

oferæta 7 druncennesse 7 leasspellunge 7 oðerra unalefedleca scylda  
smaelo hrægel weofað 7 wyrcað  
hio siolfe frætwað in bryda onlicnesse  
utwæpnedmonna friondsipes him ceapiað

Such references to overeating and drunkenness, weaving, bridal attire, and purchase of friendship particularly invoke behaviours of the impure, secular world as opposed

---

<sup>179</sup> "I tell you the truth, that I have now gone round all this monastery in order and seen the dwellings and beds of all individually: and I have found none of them except yourself occupied with his soul's salvation; but all, both men and women, are either heavy with sleep or were awake for sin. And the dwellings which were made for prayer and study, are now turned into dwellings of gluttony and drunkenness, idle talking and other unlawful transgressions. And also the virgins, who were dedicated to God, regardless of the respect due to their profession, whenever they have leisure, weave and work fine cloth, with which they adorn themselves like brides, to the risk of their position, or purchase to themselves the friendship of men without. Therefore deservedly is heavy vengeance by furious flames from heaven prepared for this place and its inhabitants" (Miller 355)

to the static contemplation of pure religious life exemplified by Adamnan in this chapter.

Book V furnishes a series of three similar episodes, in which life *godum þeawum* is placed against life lacking in all or elements of the ‘good habits’ outlined in *Interrogation* 1. The first of these (V:XII; V:XIII) is one of only five chapters (including the *Libellus*) to exceed two hundred lines in length, marking it out as of particular importance. In this chapter, the recently deceased Dryhthelm journeys through the afterlife. His narrative reiterates the consequences of failure to observe the clean Christian lifestyle promoted throughout the *Libellus*, and most explicitly in *Interrogation* 1 (extract 2.15/2.15b), to encourage the reader to correct their lifestyle:

[3.19] Namque ad excitationem uiuentium de morte animae quidam aliquandiu mortuus ad uitam resurrexit corporis, et multa memoratu digna quae uiderat narrauit; ... (CM 488.2–4)<sup>180</sup>

Following his reawakening, Dryhthelm resolves to alter his lifestyle to align better with the ideals of a life *godum þeawum*:

[3.20] ‘Noli’ inquit ‘timere, quia iam uere surrexi a morte qua tenebar, et apud homines sum iterum uiuere permissus; non tamen ea mihi, qua ante consueram, conuersatione sed multum dissimili ex hoc tempore uiuendum est.’ Statimque surgens abiit ad uillulae oratorium, et usque ad diem in oratione persistens, mox omnem quam possederat substantiam in tres diuisit portiones, e quibus unam coniugi, alteram filiis tradidit, tertiam sibi ipse retentans statim pauperibus distribuit. Nec multo post saeculi curis absolutus ad monasterium Mailros, quod Tuidi fluminis circumflexu maxima ex parte clauditur, peruenit, acceptaque tonsura locum secretae mansionis, quam praeuiderat abbas, intrauit, et ibi usque ad diem mortis in tanta mentis et corporis contritione durauit, ut multa illum quae alios

---

<sup>180</sup> “In order to arouse the living from spiritual death, a certain man already dead came back to life and related many memorable things he had seen” (CM 489)

laterent uel horrenda uel desideranda uidisse, etiamsi lingua sileret, uita loqueretur. (CM 488.13-26)<sup>181</sup>

[3.20b] Ne welle þu ðe ondredan, forðon þe ic soðlice from deaðe áaras 7 eam eft forlæten mid monnum liifgan, nales hweðre þy liife þe ic ær liifde, ah swiðe ungelice of ðisse tíde me is to lifigenne. Ond ða sona áaras 7 eode to ðære cirican þes tunes 7 oð lutterne dæg in gebede stod. Ond sona æfter þon ealle his æahte in þreo todælde; enne dæl he his wiife sealde, oðerne his bearnum, þone þridan, þe him gelomp, he instepe þearrfum gedelde: 7 æfter medmiclum fæce all weoruldþing forleorte 7 to Mailros ðem mynstre cuoom, þet is of ðem mestan dæle mid ymbebegnesse Tuede streames betyned. 7 he þer Godes þiohad 7 scare onfeng, 7 in dygle aáncorstowe ƿode, þe se abbud him foreseah; 7 þer oð ðone dæg his deaðes in swa micelum gedrehtnessum 7 forhefdnessum modes 7 lichoman áheardade 7 awunade, þette menn mehtan ongeotan, þæt he monig ðing ge egslice ge willsumlice geseh, þe oðre meoðon, þeh ðe sio tunge swigade, þet his liif wes spreccende. (Miller 424.2-17)<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> “Do not be afraid, for I have indeed risen from death which held me in its bonds, and I have been permitted to live again amongst mankind; nevertheless after this I must not live as I used to, but in a very different way.’ He rose and went to the oratory in the village and continued in prayer until daylight came. He thereupon divided everything he possessed into three parts; he gave one part to his wife, another to his sons, and the third part he reserved for himself but immediately distributed it to the poor. Soon afterwards he freed himself from the cares of this world and went to the monastery at Melrose, which is almost encircled by a bend in the river Tweed. He received the tonsure and retired to a secret retreat provided by the abbot. There, until the day of his death, he lived a life of such penance of mind and body that even if he had kept silence, his life would have declared that he had seen many things to be dreaded or desired which had been hidden from other men.” (CM 489)

<sup>182</sup> “Be not afraid, for truly I have risen from death, and am permitted to live among men once more, yet not as I lived before, but from this time on I must live very differently’. And then at once he got up and went to the chapel in the village and remained in prayer till broad daylight. And soon after that he divided all his property into three shares; one he gave to his wife, a second to his children, the third, which fell to him, he distributed on the spot to the poor: and after a short time renounced all worldly things and came to the monastery of Melrose, which is for the most part surrounded by a bend of the river Tweed. And there he entered into God’s service and received the tonsure, and proceeded to a retired hermitage, provided for him by the abbot; and there, up to the day of his death, endured and continued in such contrition and continence of mind and body, that men could see, that he had witnessed much, both terrible and desirable, that is hidden from others, as his life declared, though his tongue were silent.” (Miller 425)

Like Adamnan's, this clean lifestyle entails prayer through the night *oð lutterne dæg* (*ad diem*) and continual bodily and spiritual penance, the duration and severity of which is emphasised in the translation through doublings rendering *contritione* and *duravit* (*oð ðone dæg his deaðes in swa micelum gedrehtnessum 7 forbefðnessum modes 7 lichoman abeardade 7 awunade; ad diem mortis in tanta mentis et corporis contritione duravit*). Dryhthelm also becomes physically separated from worldly concerns after his entrance into the monastery at Melrose, thus coming under *Interrogation 1*'s *circilecum regole*.

Further, following his return from death Dryhthelm begins to divide "everything he possessed" (*omnem quam possederat substantiam*) into portions (*in tres divisit portiones*) (extract 3.20/3.20b), echoing the behavioural guidelines provided in *Interrogation 1* for division of offerings to the Church:

[3.21] Mos autem sedis apostolicae est ordinatis episcopis praecepta tradere, ut omni stipendio quod accedit quatuor debeant fieri portiones: una uidelicet episcopo et familiae propter hospitalitatem atque susceptionem, alia clero, tertia pauperibus, quarta ecclesiis reparandis. (CM 80.4-8)<sup>183</sup>

[3.21b] Þonne is þeaw þæs apostolican seðles, þonne heo biscopas halgiað, þæt him bebodu sellað, ond þætte ealles þæs ondlifenes, þe him gegonge, feower dælas beon scyle, an ærest biscope 7 his heorode for feorme 7 onfongnesse gæsta 7 cumena, oðer dæl Godes þeowum, þridda þearfum, seo feorða to edneowunge 7 to bóte Godes ciricum. (Miller 64.13-18)<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> "It is the custom of the apostolic see to give instruction to those who have been consecrated bishops that all money received should be divided into four portions: that is, one for the bishop and his household for the purposes of hospitality and entertainment, a second for the clergy, a third for the poor, and a fourth for the repair of churches." (CM 81)

<sup>184</sup> It is the custom of the apostolic seat, when they consecrate bishops, that they give them commands, and that of all the material support, which is given to them, there shall be four shares, one first for the bishop and his household for the hospitality and reception of guests and strangers, another share for the servants of God, a third for the poor, the fourth to the restoration and to the repair of God's churches.

Gregory's formula for division of wealth presented in *Interrogation* 1 is adapted to align with the needs and responsibilities of a secular household, namely a wife and children, in Dryhthelm's episode:

[3.22] mox omnem quam possederat substantiam in tres diuisit portiones, e quibus unam coniugi, alteram filiis tradidit, tertiam sibi ipse retentans statim pauperibus distribuit. (CM 488.18-20)<sup>185</sup>

[3.22b] Ond sona æfter þon ealle his æahte in þreo todælde; enne dæl he his wiife sealde, oðerne his bearnum, þone þriddan, þe him gelomp, he instepe þearrfum gedelde (Miller 424.6-8)<sup>186</sup>

In accordance with Gregory's advice in *Interrogation* 1, Dryhthelm's formula gives all that remains as alms (*pauperibus distribuit; þearfum gedelde*):

[3.23] Cum omne quod superest in causis piis ac religiosis erogandum est, Domino magistro omnium docente: 'Quod superest, date elemosinam, et ecce omnia munda sunt uobis.' (CM 80.24-27)<sup>187</sup>

[3.23b] Mid þy eall, þætte ofer bið to láfe on heora weoruldspedum, arfæstum 7 gódum is to reccenne 7 to sellenne, swa swa ealra magister Drihten Crist lærde 7 cwæð: *Quod superest, date elemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt uobis*: ðætte ofer seo 7 to láfe, sellað ælmesse, 7 eow beoð eal clæno. (Miller 66.9-14)<sup>188</sup>

This 'giving to the poor' (*þone þriddan, þe him gelomp, he instepe þearrfum gedelde*) enacts the purification associated with alms-giving in *Interrogation* 1, which is compounded in V:XII by Dryhthelm's withdrawal from secular life.

---

<sup>185</sup> "He thereupon divided everything he possessed into three parts; he gave one part to his wife, another to his sons, and the third part he reserved for himself but immediately distributed it to the poor." (CM 489)

<sup>186</sup> "And soon after that he divided his property into three shares; one he gave to his wife, a second to his children, the third, which fell to him, he distributed on the spot to the poor" (Miller 425)

<sup>187</sup> "For all that is over is to be spent for holy and religious purposes as the Lord and Master of all teaches: 'Give alms of what you have over and behold all things are clean unto you.'" (CM 81) (Luc. XI, 41)

<sup>188</sup> Because all, that is left over to remain in their worldly wealth, is to be shared out and given to the pious and good, just as the Lord Christ teacher of us all taught and said: *Quod superest, date elemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt uobis*: That which is over and in remainder, give as alms, and to you all things are clean.

In the OE version, the material purification of *Interrogation* 1 invoked through Brother Dryhthelm's almsgiving, along with the spiritual cleansing suggested by his constant prayer, is accompanied by physical purification or washing near the close of the chapter:

[3.24] Et quia locus ipse super ripam fluminis erat situs, solebat hoc creber ob magnum **castigandi corporis** affectum ingredi, ac saepius in eo supermeantibus undis inmergi; sicque ibidem quamdiu sustinere posse uidebatur, psalmis uel precibus insistere, fixusque manere ascendente aqua fluminis usque ad lumbos, aliquando et usque ad collum; atque inde egrediens ad terram, numquam ipsa **uestimenta** uda atque algida deponere curabat, donec ex suo corpore calefierent et siccarentur. (CM 496.30-498.2)<sup>189</sup>

[3.24b] Ond forðon seo seolfe stow on ofer ðæs streames wæs geseted, wæs his gewuna for ðære miclan lufan **his lichoman clænsunge**, þæt he gelomlice inn ðone stream eode 7 ðær in sealmsonge 7 in gebedum stod 7 fæste áwunode hwilum oð midden sidan, hwilum oð ðone sweoran; 7 hiene in ðæm streame sæncte 7 defde, swa longe swæ he gesegen wæs þæt he árafnan meahte. 7 þonne he ðonan gongende wæs to londe, næfre he ða his wætan **hræl** 7 þa cealdan forlætan wolde, oðþæt hio eft of his seolfes lichoman gewermedon 7 adrugedon. (Miller 434.29-436.5)<sup>190</sup>

The translation of this passage carefully redirects the Latin version, shifting the focus of the passage away from penitential suffering and on to purification of the body through its replacement of *castigandi* with *clænsunge*. In line with this new focus, the translator also alters the dynamics of the passage. Dryhthelm's static

---

<sup>189</sup> "And as his retreat was on the banks of the river, he often used to enter it in his great longing to chastise his body, frequently immersing himself beneath the water; he would remain thus motionless, reciting prayers and psalms for as long as he could endure it, while the water of the river came up to his loins and sometimes up to his neck. When he came out of the water, he would never trouble to take off his cold, wet garments until the warmth of his body had dried them." (CM 497-99)

<sup>190</sup> "And because this place lay on the bank of the river, it was his wont out of great love for bodily purification often to enter the stream, and there to continue in psalm-singing and in prayer, remaining unmoved, at times standing up to his waist, at times up to his neck; and he plunged his body and dived in the river, as long as it seemed he could endure. And when he came out on land, he never would lay aside his wet and cold garments, till they grew warm and dry from his body." (Miller 435-7)

endurance of the river's freezing waters (*fixusque manere; stod 7 fæste áwunode*) is made finite through the addition of a clause describing vigorous movement (*7 hiene in ðæm streame sæncte 7 defde*), which incorporates a suggestion of the movement involved in active washing.

Brother Drythelm provides a positive example of lifestyle correction and resulting reward in *caelestium bonorum*, and is explicitly identified as leading other Christians to correct their lifestyles in turn:

[3.25] Sicque usque ad diem suae uocationis infatigabili caelestium bonorum desiderio corpus senile inter cotidiana ieiunia domabat, multisque et uerbo et conuersatione saluti fuit. (CM 498.11-13)<sup>191</sup>

The second of this short series of morally instructive chapters opposes this positive model with an example of failure to correct unclean habits, making the contrast explicit by opening with *At contra* (CM 498.14) and *Ongeæng þissum spelle* (Miller 436.20). In this next episode (V:XIII; V:XIV), an anonymous man habitually engages in unnamed sins (*scelera* CM 498.20) and undesirable “ways” (CM 499), against which he is warned by King Cenred and encouraged to confess and amend his habits:

[3.26] Ammonebat ergo illum sedulo ut confiteretur et emendaret ac reliqueret scelera sua, priusquam subito mortis superuentu tempus omne paenitendi et emendandi perderet. Verum ille, frequentur licet admonitus, spernebat uerba promittebat. (CM 498.19-24)<sup>192</sup>

[3.26b] Monede se cyning hiene gelomlice, þæt he ondette 7 bote 7 forlete his synna 7 mandæda, ær ðon he mid ofercyme sæmninga deaðes ealle tid hreowe 7 bote forlure. Ond þeah ðe he gelomlice monad wære, hwæðre he forhogode ða hælo word, ða þe he hiene lærde, ond hiene het æfterfylgendre

<sup>191</sup> “And so until the day he was called away, in his unwearied longing for heavenly bliss, he subdued his aged body with daily fasts and led many to salvation by his words and life.” (CM 499)

<sup>192</sup> “The king warned him constantly to make confession, mend his ways, and give up his sins, before sudden death robbed him of all opportunity of repentance and amendment. But though he was frequently warned, he spurned this salutary advice, always promising that he would repent at some future time.” (CM 499)

tide, þonne he eldra wære, his synna hreowe 7 ondetnesse don. (Miller 436.27-438.2)<sup>193</sup>

Following a vision of his own judgement after death, this man suffers “everlasting and fruitless punishment” (*quam ad breue tempus cum fructu ueniae facere supersedit, in aeternum sine fructu poenis subditus facit* CM 500.32-33; *Ond þa hreowe ða he to medmicelre tide mid forgifnisse wæstmæ forælde doan, þa he witum underðeoded butan wæstmæ in ecnesse doð* Miller 440.18-20) in consequence of the failure to correct his unclean habits.

This chapter enacts the intention to instruct in good Christian behaviour and help the reader towards a clean lifestyle and salvation outlined in the preface, particularly the translator’s version (see extract 1.4/1.4b). At the same time, V:XIII/V:XIV reinforces the directives towards an ideal Christian lifestyle suggested in the *Interrogations*. Bede furnishes this episode with an exegetical appendix to the man’s vision, describing how his fate in the afterlife might have been avoided (CM 502.5-17), prefaced by an explicit identification of the episode as morally edifying:

[3.27] De quo constat quia, sicut beatus papa Gregorius de quibusdam scribit, non pro se ista, cui non profuere, sed pro aliis uiderit, qui eius interitum cognoscentes differre tempus paenitentiae, dum uacat, timerent, ne improvisio mortis articulo praeuerti inpaenitentes perirent. (CM 500.33-502.5)<sup>194</sup>

The identification is reinforced in the closing sentence of the chapter:

---

<sup>193</sup> “The king often admonished him to confess and reform and renounce his sin and wickedness, before he should suddenly by the advent of death lose all time for repentance and amendment. And though often admonished he disregarded the words of salvation, with which he warned him, promising at a later time, when older, to repent and confess his sins.” (Miller 437-9)

<sup>194</sup> “From this it is clear, as the blessed Pope Gregory writes about certain people, that he saw this vision not for his own benefit, because it did not profit him, but for the sake of others; so that they, hearing of his fate, may fear to put off their time of repentance while they still have the opportunity, and not be cut off by sudden death and die impenitent.” (CM 503)



[3.28] Hanc historiam, sicut a uenerabili antistite Pecthelmo didici,  
simpliciter ob salutem legentium siue audientium narrandum esse putauī.  
(CM 502.18-20)<sup>195</sup>

This exegetical passage pays particular attention to ‘deeds’ (*facta* CM 502.7), representing outward behaviour, and ‘thoughts’ (*cogitationes* CM 502.7), or mental and spiritual activity. The relationship between deeds and thoughts receives particular attention in *Interrogation* 9.

### *Cleanliness in Body, Mind, and Deed*

*Interrogation* 9 repeats *Interrogation* 8’s ruling regarding restoration of bodily purity after sexual contact before entrance into sacred space, this time addressing the issue of sexual dreaming. After these dreams, the *Interrogation* argues, the dreamer *mid soðum onlicnessum in gēpohte bið bismiten* (Miller 84.30-31), and must be washed with water (*mid wætre to āpweanne* Miller 84.31-86.1) before re-entering sacred space.

*Interrogation* 9’s ‘washing’, like that of *Interrogation* 8, is both physical and figurative:

[3.29] sed **lauandus** est aqua, ut culpas cogitationis lacrimis **abluat** (CM 98.24-25)<sup>196</sup>

[3.29b] Ac he is mid wætre to āpweanne, þæt is, þæt he þa synne þæs gēpohtes mid tearum āpwea (Miller 84.31-86.2)<sup>197</sup>

This purification process employs a physical behaviour to ‘wash’ the mind, as also demonstrated in the standing or ‘diving’ of Dryhthelm in the river in extract 3.24/3.24b. Most of *Interrogation* 9 is in fact given over to exploration of the relationship between thought and behaviour, with the aim of providing guidelines to decipher the level of impurity resulting from a ‘night-time illusion’, or a ‘wet dream’

---

<sup>195</sup> “I thought I ought to tell this story simply, just as I learned it from the venerable bishop Penthelm, for the benefit of those who read or hear it.” (CM 503)

<sup>196</sup> “and he must be washed with water in the sense that he should wash away the sins of thought with his tears” (CM 99)

<sup>197</sup> But he is to wash with water, that is, that he wash the sin of his thought with tears

incorporating both a mental and a physical element, according to its avenue of access into the mind of the 'sleeper':

[3.30] Sed est in eadam inlusione ualde necessaria discretio, quae subtiliter pensari debeat, ex qua re accedat menti dormientis; aliquando enim ex crapula, aliquando ex naturae superfluitate uel infirmitate, aliquando ex cogitatione contingit. (CM 98.26-30)<sup>198</sup>

This association between mental and physical action is also reflected in the recurring emphasis on consideration and judgement before taking action, which is explored through the translator's doublings in chapter 2. The figurative and actual cleansing of the impure body in *Interrogations* 8 and 9, and the morally instructive illustrations explored above, reveal a tension surrounding the Christian body and its relationship with sacred space and ritual (Lees 20). This relationship, through the potential it holds to restrict access to the Church and liturgical rites, regulates the behaviour of those on the journey towards a clean lifestyle and salvation by rewarding life *godum þeawum* with access, and punishing incorrect observance and sin with deprivation and exclusion.

The power and symbolism of such exclusion is particularly resonant in the last chapter of Book V which I will examine. This last episode also uses the tale of a monk who refused to correct his trajectory off the path towards clean Christian living and salvation. Like the incorrect behaviour of the inmates of Coldingham, the behaviour of this monk is directly contrasted with the correct behaviour of others:

[3.31] Seruiebat autem multum ebrietati et ceteris uitae remissioris illecebris, magisque in officina sua die noctuque residere, quam ad

---

<sup>198</sup> "But in this same illusion a very necessary distinction must be carefully made as to the reason why it enters into the sleeper's mind; sometimes it happens through gluttony, sometimes through a natural superfluity or weakness, sometimes through the thoughts." (CM 99)

psallendum atque orandum in ecclesia audiendumque cum fratribus uerbum uitae concurrere consuevit. (CM 502.28-31)<sup>199</sup>

The man fails to follow his brethren in correct observance, preferring worldly pleasures and the personal pursuits of his workshop. A vision of hell reveals the consequences of this behaviour in his afterlife immediately before his death (CM 504.1-11), but he is also punished for failing to correct his lifestyle in the living world he leaves behind:

[3.32] ... sine uiatico salutis obiit, et corpus eius in ultimis est monasterii locis humatum, neque aliquis pro eo uel missas facere uel psalmos cantare uel saltim orare praesumebat. (CM 504.12-44)<sup>200</sup>

The man's behaviour leads directly to permanent exclusion from both the sacred space and the liturgical rites of his community in the living world after his death. Grounding her study in the idea that after relinquishing an individual sense of self upon entering a monastic institution (in favour of becoming part of a collective sense of self), being removed from this collective would cause psychological suffering (Flint, 158-9), Valerie Flint has explored the use of distance as a disciplinary tool. Physical distancing of individuals guilty of sinful behaviour from the collective consciousness of their monastic community, she argues, demonstrated "the *moral* distance between the good monk and the bad; a distance the bad monk, it is hoped, will want to physically cross" (Flint 151). Physical isolation or exclusion may thus be a means of impressing on the guilty party the gravity of his sins, forcing him to correct his behaviour before being allowed to rejoin the collective consciousness.

The severity of the man's punishment in being permanently excluded both from his monastic community and from Church ritual after his death (removing any possibility of relief through earthly prayers), along with his eternal punishment in

---

<sup>199</sup> "But he was much addicted to drunkenness and the other pleasures of a loose life; he used to remain in his workshop day and night, rather than go to the church with the brothers to sing psalms and pray and listen to the word of life." (CM 503)

<sup>200</sup> "he died without receiving the viaticum and his body was buried in the furthest corner of the monastery; nor did anyone venture to say masses or sing psalms or even pray for him." (CM 505)

hell, are intended to impress the severity of his faults upon readers of the tale, encouraging them to make the necessary corrections to avoid such a fate. This motive is made explicit at the close of the chapter:

[3.33] uidit etiam suum infelix inter tales carcerem, quo miserabilius ipse desperata salute periret, sed uiuentibus, qui haec cognouissent, causam salutis sua perditione relinqueret. Factum est hoc nuper in prouincia Berniciorum, ac longe lateque diffamatum multos ad agendam et non differendam scelerum suorum paenitudinem prouocauit. Quod utinam exhinc etiam nostrarum lectione litterarum fiat! (CM 504.21-27)<sup>201</sup>

[3.33b] Geseah he eac swylce his sylfes ungesælige stowe 7 carcern betwyh swylce, þæt he þy earmlicor georwenedre hælo her nu forwurde; ac lifigendum mannum, þe þas þing ongeton, he forlet hælo intingan mid his forlorenesse. Wæs þis niwan geworden on Beornica mægþe, 7 feor 7 wide gemæred; 7 he monige forð acigde butan yldincge þæt hi heora mandæda hreowe dydon, þæt ic eac swylce wisce forð swa on leornunge ura stafa. (Miller 444.20-26)<sup>202</sup>

The mode of this passage echoes the similar closings of each of the two preceding episodes. These closing passages reinforce the relationship shared by these three chapters as tales of moral instruction, and establish their relevance to the motivations expressed (particularly in the Old English version) in the *HE* Preface (extract 3.1/3.1b)—a motivation which the *Libellus* is apt to aid and support.

---

<sup>201</sup> “The unhappy man also saw his own place of imprisonment among them, so that he might perish the more miserably himself, and yet might leave behind him a reason why those who were still alive and knew of this, should seek their own salvation by his own perdition. This happened lately in the kingdom of Bernicia. The story spread far and wide and roused many people to do penance for their sins without delay. And may the reading of this account of ours have the same effect!” (CM 505)

<sup>202</sup> “He saw also the place of his own unhappiness and his prison among such, so that he should perish the more miserably, even in this life despairing of salvation; but by his perdition he left for the living, who heard of it, a motive for salvation. This lately took place in the province of Bernicia, and was celebrated far and wide; and he stirred up many to repent their sins without delay, the thing which I also desire from this time on likewise from the reading of our account.” (Miller 445)

### *The Libellus and Moral Structure in the OE and Latin HE texts*

The translator's placement of his version of the *Libellus* between Books Three and Four brings the text, in its penitential capacity, closer to explicitly penitential material in the later books of the *HE*, in the same way as the move increases proximity between the *Libellus* and like documents such as the synodal books of Book IV. Nicholas Higham, identifying "furthering of Christianity via active co-operation between king, bishop, and papacy" as the core of Bede's moral agenda, has already discerned Book III to be at the moral centre of the *HE*'s narrative patterning (Higham 151). The translator promotes co-operation as a theme within the *Libellus*, particularly in his rendering of *Interrogation* 6, which he amends to encourage intercontinental co-operation between bishops, and *Interrogation* 7, which addresses relationships with other Churches directly. However, the translator's moral agenda appears to centre more on individual behaviour than on a collective, co-operative ideal. St. Jacques, although seeming to pass over the *Libellus* itself, recognises the differing perceptions of the two authors and the translator's particularly moral direction (85). St. Jacques explores the translator's moralistic tendencies manifested through his frequent embellishments of the narrative, and his methodology in selectively omitting or emphasising chosen passages. Emphasis of penitential or cleansing suffering in Hell or during life receives particular attention (St. Jacques 100), but the translator also often embellishes or particularises positive attributes of Bede's figures, "making the character a little more saintly, more evil, or simply more human than the original description" (St. Jacques 100). These alterations to the text, considered alongside the translator's tendency to ignore or avoid such aspects of Bede's text as his careful provision of evidence and authorisation; inclusion of geographical detail; and so on, suggest that the translator's strategy placed more value on the attributes of figures and episodes than on historical detail and authorisation. Such freedom from the chronological and historiographical concerns over which Bede agonises allows for the frequent deletion of documentary evidence,

geographical position, dating, and other details, which is evident in the Old English text.

The translator’s deletions from Bede’s text fundamentally alter its shape and the progression of themes within it. At its most basic level, the translator’s system of excision alters the balance of weight across Bede’s five book structure. Based on the number of lines occupied in each of the leading editions of the Latin and Old English *HE* texts, the table below compares distribution of weight over the five books of each text, with the Latin text represented on the left and the OE on the right:

TABLE 3: *Mechanical Structure of the Latin and OE Versions of Bede’s HE: Weight Distribution by Book*<sup>203</sup>

	Book 1		Book 2		Book 3		Book 4		Book 5	
Total Lines	1638	659	1378	923	1874	1960	2041	2135	2038	1585
% Overall Total	18	9	15	13	21	27	23	29	23	22
Ave Chp. Length	48	37	69	58	62	85	64	65	85	72

Book I clearly suffers most under the translator’s knife, being reduced to forty percent of its original volume, primarily through deletion of twelve of its thirty four chapters. In comparison, of Book IV’s thirty-two chapters, only two are excised, and the Book in fact increases in length. Book III likewise increases despite deletion of three of its thirty chapters, although this increase is aided by the translator’s redistribution of the *Libellus*, which is incorporated into the end of Book III. The translator’s distribution of weight per book increases with each Book to a peak at Book IV, before declining in Book V towards the close of the work, even if the 367

<sup>203</sup> Due to the differences in presentation between the editions of Colgrave and Mynor’s and Miller, the length in lines given above can only provide an approximate guide. Over ten randomly selected lines, Colgrave and Mynor’s edition averaged 9 words to a line, while Miller’s averaged 10. Taking the need for Old English to include more pronouns and so on to express the incorporated elements of Latin into consideration, this leaves the line lengths of the two texts roughly comparable.

lines occupied by the transplanted OE version of the *Libellus* are discounted. This results in a particular concentration of content in the work into Books Three and Four, suggesting that the translator found more of value to his cause in these later, less reduced Books than in the earlier two.

Higham's recognition of Book III as the centre of Bede's "historical project" (Higham 144) may inform our assessment of the translator's allocation of value and motivations in adjusting the balance of the *HE* in such a way. Bede continually isolates particular figures as central exempla, presenting them in serial or individual episodes to put forward several ideal modes of behaviour. Figures such as Edwin, Oswald, Aidan, and Hild, for example, are afforded very large portions of the text and held up as positive models. Defining a moral or behavioural exemplar loosely as a character or event that is characterised as good or bad and illustrated with penalties or rewards accordingly, the distribution of Bede's moral chapters can be mapped as in the following table, in which shaded cells indicate chapters containing exempla.<sup>204</sup>

---

<sup>204</sup> For comparative maps of the Latin and Old English *HE* texts, see Appendix D.

TABLE 4: *Latin HE Moral Structure Map*

Chapter	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5
1	107	217*	35	75	41
2	37	102	60	50	53
3	25	40	49	173	46
4	9	59*	63	31	27
5	19	85	62	100*	26
6	22	36	32	30	79
7	108	40	74	32	57*
8	21	48*	70	26	39
9	17	86	52	59	69
10	18	90*	25	31	70
11	24	70*	74	55	56
12	77	115	34	56	193
13	23	66	48	72	71
14	34	47	88	81	40
15	60	35	29	13	49
16	14	37	22	44	42*
17	64	39*	73	52*	39*
18	27	52*	29	57	43
19	26	50*	143	110	250*
20	45	64	14	60	41
21	45		47	13	390*
22	17		79	73	45
23	38*		71	167	87
24	21*		93	103	185
25	53		227	101	
26	30		65	58	
27	410*		68	76	
28	22*		36	76	
29	46*		81*	56	
30	39*		24	46	
31	30*			36	
32	68*			35	
33	21				
34	21				
<i>Model Content (Cbps)</i>	7 (20%)	8 (40%)	17 (57%)	15 (47%)	7 (29%)

Chapters containing such episodes and figures thus seem to dominate Bede's *HE*, comprising around 40% of its 140 chapters, and depicting figures ranging in social identity from kings and queens through religious officers and the monastic to lay people. Book III can here be seen to contain the highest concentration of edifying episodes, closely followed by Book IV.

Only two of the chapters that the translator removes for his version—III:XXVI and IV:XIV—contain edifying examples. The first of these is directly linked to the previous chapter, which details the synod at Whitby at which the



correct Easter observance was argued and decided. This chapter forms part of its predecessor in demonstrating a positive model of Easter and monastic observance to uphold the decision of the synod. Presumably, this chapter is a casualty of the translator's systematic removal of material regarding the correct observance of Easter which, in his ninth-century cultural context, was no longer a priority. Deletion of the second, IV:XIV, is less easily explained as it clearly supports a positive model of King Oswald presented in Book III. This connection itself may provide sufficient explanation, however, as the episode depicted in IV:XIV is at a remove of forty-four chapters from the example to which it refers. As such, it may have been excised as an interruption to the dramatic flow of the narrative and an apparent repetition of earlier, like material.

Aside from his deletion of these two chapters, Bede's translator leaves his moral-content-bearing chapters in place, although their OE versions frequently suffer internal excisions or expansions, merge two or more chapters together, or split a chapter into two. The following table illustrates the distribution of chapters within the OE version of the *HE*, with moralistically valuable episodes highlighted and corresponding Latin chapter positions in square brackets:

TABLE 5: *Old English HE Moral Structure Map*<sup>205</sup>

Chapter	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5
1	[1] 79	[1] 72*	[1/2] 87	[1] 92	[1] 48
2	[2] 3	[2] 96	[3] 34	[2] 48	[2] 60
3	[3] 15	[3] 36	[5] 71	[3] 201	[3] 54
4	[4] 10	[4] 34	[6] 34	[4] 35	[4] 31
5	[5] 10	[5] 86	[7] 79	[5] 80*	[5] 32
6	[6] 14	[6] 42	[8] 82	[5] 14	[6] 96
7	[7] 127	[7/8] 41	[9] 55	[6] 29	[7] 33
8	[8] 20	[9] 95	[10] 27	[7] 40	[8] 27
9	[11/12] 64	[10/12] 138	[11] 79	[8] 12	[9] 74
10	[13] 17	[13] 73	[12] 40	[8] 18	[10] 17
11	[14] 35	[14] 41	[13] 56	[9] 44	[10] 67
12	[15/16] 66	[15] 36	[14] 96	[9] 26	[11] 57
13	[23] 36	[16] 22	[15] 39	[10] 35	[12] 227
14	[25] 55	[16/17] 22	[16-20] 316	[11] 63	[13] 83
15	[26] 36	[18] 18	[21] 52	[12] 12	[14] 47
16	[27/29/32] 27	[20] 71	[22] 90	[12] 42	[18] 46
17	[33] 22		[23] 80	[13/15] 90	[19] 245
18	[34] 23		[24] 101	[16] 50	[20] 45
19			[27] 75	[17] 60*	[21] 54
20			[28] 41	[18] 40	[22] 59
21			[26] 27	[19] 146	[23] 42
22			[30] 32	[21] 16	[24] 141
23			[I:XXVII] 367*	[22] 90	
24				[23] 177	
25				[24] 123	
26				[25] 119	
27				[26] 64	
28				[27] 73	
29				[28] 83	
30				[29] 67	
31				[30] 57	
32				[31] 48	
33				[32] 41	
34					
<i>Model Content (Chps)</i>	6 (33%)	8 (50%)	14 (61%)	16 (48%)	7 (31%)
<i>Excised Chapters</i>	12 (35%)	2 (10%)	3 (10%)	2 (1%)	3 (13%)

Over sixty percent of Book III is now occupied with episodes containing edifying examples, flanked on either side by concentrations of such episodes of around half in Books II and IV. The translator's deletions from the text, which range in severity in

<sup>205</sup> Figures in square brackets present the number(s) of the corresponding chapter(s) in the Latin *HE*; figures on the right give the size of the chapter in lines as it appears in Miller's edition.

each book from 35% of chapters in Book I to a mere 1% in Book IV, thus maintain Bede's basic structural distribution of moral exempla, but intensify its levels of concentration. Combined with the concentrating effect of the translator's deletions (which results in a considerable difference in volume between Books I and II of the Old English *HE* in comparison with Books III, IV, and V), the translation's intensified moral structure places the largest and most morally saturated Books, Books III and IV, at the structural centre of the work.

The translator thus places the *Libellus* at the moral and structural apex of his version of the *HE*, surrounding it with edifying episodes to complement its instructional content. Through spatial alteration to the text of the *Libellus* and the *HE*, and internal manipulations of the *Libellus* text itself (such as those enacted through the doublings explored in chapter 2), the translator integrates the *Libellus* into the content of Books III, IV, and V. The translator's version of the *Libellus* text thus interacts with both key morally exemplary and penitential episodes in the *HE* and like administrative documents the translator has retained, justifying its placement amongst these features in the final three books of the *HE*.

## Chapter 4—*Interrogation 5*: A Case Study in Style, Placement, and Contexts

The translator's emphasis on moral improvement and clean Christian living, and the affinity with surrounding textual content that he creates through proximity to morally didactic episodes by repositioning the *Libellus* text to the end of Book III, come together with relevance to ninth-century social climate in *Interrogations* 4 and 5, which address the issue of consanguinity in marriage.<sup>206</sup> Although other *Interrogations* no doubt remained relevant to discourse on appropriate Christian behaviour and penance into his lifetime and beyond, the content of the translator's *Interrogation 5* interacts directly with contemporary events, placing it at a critical juncture between the *Libellus*, the *HE*, and ninth-century England. As Sharon Rowley has argued, this contemporary relevance may have encouraged the translator to retain the *Libellus* for his translation of Bede's *HE*, and influenced both his decision regarding its position in the finished work and various of his changes to its content (92).

The manner in which the translator has integrated *Interrogation 5* into his version of the *Libellus* may suggest that it held particular significance for him. This suggestion lies in the rhetorical structure the translator seems to have built, through framing of the responses, for his version of the *Libellus* text. Generally, the translator begins his translation of each 'response' with relative fidelity to the Latin text. Only two of the nine *Interrogations* show deviation from this general trend in the opening of their response. Where Bede's version of the 'response' to *Interrogation 1* opens with *Sacra Scriptura testatur* following the rubricated *Respondit Gregorius papa urbis Romae* (CM 80.1-2), the translator opens his rendition of the response with *Cwæð he* (Miller 64:10). The use of *cwæðan* at this juncture, between

---

<sup>206</sup>*Interrogation 4* is very short, occupying only five lines in Colgrave and Mynors' edition of the Latin text and Miller's edition of the OE version. This *Interrogation* is integrated into the opening of *Interrogation 5* in Capitula and Letter types of *Libellus* MS (Meyvaert 24), and will be considered alongside *Interrogation 5* here.

the first question and its reply, initiates a reading of the *Libellus* text as direct speech and authorises the content of the response as supported by the ‘voice’ of Gregory.<sup>207</sup>

At the opening of the response to *Interrogation* 5, the translator repeats this rhetorical manoeuvre:

[4.1] Respondit Gregorius: Quaedam terrena lex in Romana republica permittit, ut siue frater et soror seu duorum fratrum germanorum uel duarum sororum filius et filia misceantur. Sed experimento didicimus ex tali coniugio sobolem non posse succrescere, et sacra lex prohibet cognationis turpitudinem reuelare. (CM 84.4-8)<sup>208</sup>

[4.1b] RESPONSIO.

Cwæð he: sum eorðlic æ in þære Romaniscan cynnewisan forlæteð, þætte oððe broðor oððe sweostor oððe twegra gebroðra bearn oððe twegea gesweostra sunu 7 dohtor gemengde wæren in gesinscipe. Ac we þæt cuðlice oncneowon 7 ongeton, þætte þæt tuddur growan ne weaxan meahte of swylcum gesinscipe; ond seo halige æ bewereð 7 forbeodeð þa scondlicnesse onwreon mægsibba. (Miller 70.3-9)<sup>209</sup>

This addition draws attention to the position of *Interrogation* 5 in the dialogic structure of the OE *Libellus* text. Such singular repetition of *cweðan* to open a

---

<sup>207</sup> The *Libellus* translation found in the Old English *HE* shares this feature with Wærferð’s translation of another Gregorian text, the *Dialogues*. Here a conversation between Pope Gregory and his deacon, Peter, is used as a vehicle for various miracle stories and saints’ lives with a moral objective. Wærferð emphasises the conversational character of the *Dialogues* through verb clauses such as “Petrus him to cwæð”, “Petrus cwæð”, “Petrus hine þa frægn” and so on, accompanied by “Gregorius him andswarode” or variations (Hecht), where Latin texts have either “Petrus” or “Gregorius.” Simeon Potter explored the relationship between the Old English *HE* and Wærferð’s *Dialogues* in an extensive article published in 1930, observing that in their approach to additions to their respective originals during translation the two texts “are very similar” (Potter 7).

<sup>208</sup> “A certain secular law in the Roman State allows that the son and daughter of a brother and sister, or of two brothers or two sisters may be married. But we have learned from experience that the offspring of such marriages cannot thrive. Sacred law forbids a man to uncover the nakedness of his kindred” (CM 85)

<sup>209</sup> He said: an earthly law in the Roman commonwealth allows, that either a brother or a sister or two brothers’ children or the son and daughter of two sisters were mingled in marriage. But we know and perceive, that the offspring may not grow nor develop from such a marriage; and the holy law warns and forbids the shame of relatives be uncovered.

response places that response at the centre of the translator's rhetorical structure for the *Libellus*, suggesting that it held particular relevance to the translator's strategy for the *Interrogations* as part of his version of the *HE*.

The "Question and Answer" version of the *Libellus* found in Bede's *HE* divides the single *Interrogation* concerning degrees of affinity found in other types of text into two distinct *Interrogations*, one receiving a positive and one a negative reply. *Interrogation* 4's question is specific and pointed, and receives a direct, affirmative reply:

[4.2] III. Interrogatio Augustini: Si debeant duo germani fratres singulas sorores accipere, quae sunt ab illis longa progenie generatae?

Respondit Gregorius: Hoc fieri modis omnibus licet: nequaquam enim in sacris eloquiis inuenitur quod huic capitulo contradicere uideatur. (CM 82.26-31)<sup>210</sup>

[4.2b] INTERROGATIO III.

Hwæðer moton twegen æwe gebroðor twa geswustor in gesinscipe onfon,  
þa ðe beoð feorr heora cneorisse from him acende?

RESPONSIO.

Dis mot beon swa; 7 callum gemetum þæt is alyfed. Forðon nis ówer gemeted in halgum bocum, þátte þisse frignesne wærword sy gesegen.  
(Miller 68.22-6)<sup>211</sup>

The translator's changes to this *Interrogation* are minimal, and function predominantly to emphasise the polarity of the reply to *Interrogation* 4 to that of

---

<sup>210</sup> "IV. Augustine's fourth question. May two brothers marry two sisters provided they belong to a family not related to them?

Gregory answered: This is entirely permissible, for there is nothing in the sacred writings on this point which seems to forbid it." (CM 83)

<sup>211</sup> QUESTION IV.

Whether two brothers may lawfully receive two sisters in marriage, who are born far from them in their descent?

ANSWER

This may be so; and that is allowed in all ways. Because nothing is found in the holy books, that seems to be opposed to this question.

*Interrogation 5.* The word order of the Latin text is replicated precisely in the OE version over the first half of the ‘question’, disrupted only by the translator’s insertion of *in gesinscipe* —‘in marriage’—extrapolating the nature of the receipt implied through the Latin’s *accipere*. The translator will repeat this addition in the opening sentence of his version of the response to *Interrogation 5*:

[4.3] Quaedam terrena lex in Romana republica permittit, ut siue frater et soror seu duorum fratrum germanorum uel duarum sororum filius et filia misceantur. (CM 84.4-6)<sup>212</sup>

[4.3b] Cwæð he: sum eorðlic æ in þære Romaniscan cynnewisan forlæteð, þætte oððe broðor oðþe sweostor oððe twegra gebroðra bearn oððe twegæ gesweostra sunu 7 dohtor gemengde **wæren in gesinscipe**. (Miller 70.3-6)

213

This second addition of *in gesinscipe* provides a direct link between the subject matter of these two *Interrogations* through repeated vocabulary.

These additions are accompanied by repeated insertion of additional vocabulary related to ideas of marriage and kinship into *Interrogation 5*. *Betweohn* (highlighting interrelationship) for example, is twice added to the early passages:

[4.4] Vsque ad quodam generationem fideles debeant cum propinquis sibi coniugio copulari; ... (CM 84.1-2)<sup>214</sup>

[4.4b] Oð hwelce cneorisse sculon cristne men mid heora mægum him **betweohn** in gesinscipe geþeodde beon? (Miller 68.27-8)<sup>215</sup>

[4.5] Vnde necesse est, ut iam tertia uel quarta generatio fidelium licentur sibi iungi debeat; nam secunda, quam praediximus, a se omnimodo debet abstinere. (CM 84.9-11)<sup>216</sup>

---

<sup>212</sup> “A certain secular law in the Roman State allows that the son and daughter of a brother and sister, or of two brothers or two sisters may be married.” (CM 85)

<sup>213</sup> He said: an earthly law in the Roman commonwealth allows, that either a brother or a sister or two brothers’ children or the son and daughter of two sisters were mingled in marriage.

<sup>214</sup> “Within what degrees may the faithful marry their kindred; ...?” (CM 85)

<sup>215</sup> Until which generation should Christian men be joined in marriage among their kin?

<sup>216</sup> “... hence it is necessary that the faithful should only marry relations three or four times removed, while those twice removed must not marry in any case, as we have said.” (CM 85)

[4.5b] Forðon is ned, þætte cristene men in þære þriddan cneorisse oððe in þære feorðan him **betweohn** wifian scyle, forþon seo æftere **cneoris**, þe we forecwædon, alle gemete is to forbeorene 7 to forlætenne. (Miller 70.9-12)

217

In both instances, *betweohn* is directly associated with the idea of marriage (*gesinscipe*, *wifian*). Other related concepts are similarly emphasised or clarified through addition of *beorn* (Miller 70.4), *cneoris* (Miller 70.11) and *wer ond wiif* (Miller 70.15) to the translation, creating a pattern of reinforcements of the concept of marriage and its resulting interrelationships.

The translator's second significant alteration to *Interrogation 4* works alongside the alignment demonstrated by his addition of *in gesinscipe*, to emphasise the positivity of *Interrogation 4*'s response in comparison to that of *Interrogation 5*. At the opening of the 'response', the translator expands the Latin clause *hoc fieri omnibus licet* into two complimentary OE clauses:

[4.6] Hoc fieri modis omnibus licet; ... (CM 82.29)<sup>218</sup>

[4.6b] Ðis mot ben swa; 7 eallum gemetum þæt is alyfed. (Miller 68.24)<sup>219</sup>

Effectively, the translator's construction functions in the same manner as a doubling, with one half providing a direct or customary translation of the Latin (*eallum gemetum þæt is alyfed*), and the other emphasising or expanding on the original. In this case, the translator's addition works on emphasising the 'allowance' suggested by the Latin's *licet* and OE's *alyfed* through *mot* in an added clause. This added positivity, alongside the separation of the response to issues surrounding marriage into two separate *Interrogations*, heightens the definition between degrees of affinity *allowed* within marriage, affirmed here in *Interrogation 4*, and degrees within which marriage is *not* allowed, to be extrapolated in *Interrogation 5*.

---

<sup>217</sup>Therefore it is needful, that Christian men should marry among the third generation or the fourth, because the second generation, that we mentioned before, is in all ways to be abstained and to be abandoned.

<sup>218</sup> "This is entirely permissible, ..." (CM 83)

<sup>219</sup> This may be so; and that is allowed in all ways.



*Interrogation 5* presents a compound question comprised of two distinct issues, one regarding marriage between those related by blood, and the other between those related through marriage into the blood family:

[4.7] Vsque ad quodam generationem fideles debeant cum propinquis sibi coniugio copulari; ... (CM 84.1-2)<sup>220</sup>

[4.7b] Oð hwelce cneorisse sculon cristne men mid heora mægum him betweohn in gesinscipe geþeodde beon? (Miller 68.27-8)<sup>221</sup>

[4.8] ... et novercis et cognatis si liceat copulari coniugio. (CM 84.2-3)<sup>222</sup>

[4.8b] 7 steopmodrum 7 broðorwiifum ac þæt alyfed is, þæt heo moten in gesinscipe gegadrode beon? (Miller 68-9.28-2)<sup>223</sup>

Like its ‘question’, the reply to *Interrogation 5* may be divided into two parts. The reply responds to the two parts of the ‘question’ first, and then moves on to exemplify the principle of tailored consideration by offering advice especially applicable to the situation presented to Augustine in England. This concept of consideration according to particular circumstance is promoted, particularly through doublings as explored in chapter 2, in *Interrogations 1, 2, and 3*.

As we have also seen in previous discussion, the translator’s alterations to *Interrogation 5* do not directly contest the contents of his source text, but rather work subtly to conceal, emphasise, or modify particular points. Perhaps the most obvious and consistent of the translator’s tools to advance this aim—addition to the text through ‘doubling’—again plays an important role in this *Interrogation*. Considering the size of *Interrogation 5*, which occupies forty lines in Colgrave and Mynor’s edition of the Latin and forty-three in Miller’s OE edition (exceeded in size only by *Interrogations 8 and 9*), the doublings worked into the text of this

---

<sup>220</sup> “Within what degree may the faithful marry their kindred” (CM 85)

<sup>221</sup> Until which generation should Christian men be joined in marriage among their kin?

<sup>222</sup> “and is it lawful to marry a stepmother or a sister-in-law?” (CM 85)

<sup>223</sup> And with stepmothers and brothers’ wives also is that allowed, when they have the opportunity to be united in marriage?

*Interrogation* are relatively very few, numbering only four. All four doublings are concentrated, however, within a six-line passage, and emphasise four concepts vital to the argument of the *Interrogation*.

The first of these, *oncneowon 7 ongeton* (*didicimus* CM 84.7; Miller 70.6), is not repeated elsewhere in the translation, although *disco* is doubled in translation several times (Waite 209). *Oncneowon 7 ongeton*'s fellow doublings share one element, *(ge)leornian* or *(ge)lêran*, and add one variable element (*didicit in spiritu* CM 176.8-9, *geleornade he in gaste 7 he onwriġen wæs* Miller 126.7; *didicit*: CM 288.27, *onget he 7 geleornade (in gaste)* Miller 234.7-8; CM 334.15, *sægde 7 larde* Miller 258.31-2; CM 532.8, *geseah 7 geleornode* Miller 468.1). The translator's doubling for *didicimus* in *Interrogation* 5, however, does not share this most common element, but renders instead with a pairing selected for rhythmic effect, repeating *on*:

[2.6] Sed experimento **didicimus** ex tali coniugio sobolem non posse **succrescere**, et sacra lex **prohibet** cognationis turpitudinem reuelare. (CM 84.6-8)<sup>224</sup>

[2.6b] Ac we þæt cuðlice **oncneowon 7 ongeton**, þætte þæt tuddur **growan ne weaxan** meahte of swylcum gesinscipe; ond seo halige á **bewereð 7 forbodeð** þa scondlicnesse onwreon mægsibba. (Miller 70.6-9)<sup>225</sup>

*Oncnāwan* is also used in the translation to render *persentire* (Miller 38.2); *probare* (Miller 196.6); and *cognoscere* (Miller 330.11), and doubled with repetitions of *Interrogation* 5's *oncneowon 7 ongeton*, *onget 7 oncneow* (Miller 328.23) for *audire*, and *oncneow 7 ongeat* (Miller 330.15) for *intelligere* (Waite 531). The translator's replacement for *disco* in *Interrogation* 5, also discussed in chapter 2, emphasises the importance of perception and consideration in Gregory's ruling on consanguinity in marriage.

<sup>224</sup> "But we have learned from experience that the offspring of such marriages cannot thrive. Sacred law forbids a man to uncover the nakedness of his kindred" (CM 85)

<sup>225</sup> But we know and perceive, that the offspring may not grow nor develop from such a marriage; and the holy law warns and forbids the shame of relatives be uncovered.

Just as he extends the source of the authority behind Gregory's opening ruling in the response—emphasising erudition and contemporary observation—so the translator also accentuates the key fact drawn from this wisdom, rendering the Latin's (*non posse*) *succrescere* with the doubling *growan ne weaxan*. This negatively qualified phrase expresses the threat which a union between siblings, such as those cited as allowed in secular Roman law at the opening of the *Interrogation* (extract 4.1/4.1b), poses to the possibility of healthy offspring. *Succrescere* occurs only once in the *HE*. As such, when the translator encounters it here, his choice of translation is not effected by habits previously established as he worked through his translation task. Elsewhere in the Anglo-Saxon translation tradition, *growan* and *weaxan* share *crescere* among their several extant glosses, and typically of doubling partners are very close in sense (Bosworth & Toller). The translator's repetition of the concept behind *succrescere*—growth and development—emphasises the secular justification for prohibition of marriage between siblings in the passage.

The translator continues to place emphasis on the key concepts behind this opening passage in his treatment of *prohibet* (*bewereð 7 forbeodeð*, extract 4.9/4.9b), expressing the attitude of sacred law towards marriage between close kindred. Not surprisingly, eleven of the twenty-two uses of *prohibeo* in Bede's *HE* are contained within the *Libellus* text, which is effectively a document of allowances and prohibitions. Over the collective uses of *prohibere* and its noun form *prohibitio*, the translator invariably renders with *bewerian*, with the sole exception of the doubled rendering found in *Interrogation* 5. This doubling thus appears to be constructed deliberately, to enhance the sense of proscription attendant on the idea of marriage between close kin in *halige æ* ('sacred law').

In the final doubling worked into *Interrogation* 5, the translator rounds out his abstract outline of the central points of the *Interrogation*, emphasising the ideal solution to errors existing in established marriages:

[4.5] Vnde necesse est, ut iam tertia uel quarta generatio fidelium licentur sibi iungi debeat; nam secunda, quam praediximus, a se omnimodo debet **abstinere**. (CM 84.9-11)<sup>226</sup>

[4.5b] Forðon is ned, þætte cristene men in þære þriddan cneorisse oððe in þære feorðan him betweohn wifian scyle, forþon seo æftere cneoris, þe we forecwædon, alle gemete is **to forbeorene 7 to forlætenne**. (Miller 70.9-12)<sup>227</sup>

Like *bewereð 7 forbeodeð* (extract 4.9/4.9b), *to forbeorene 7 to forlætenne* (*abstinere*) is a unique rendering of its source within the translation. *Abstineo* is not frequently used in Bede's *HE*, occurring only ten times, seven of which are confined to the *Libellus* text. *Abstineo* is rendered with a doubling only once, and is otherwise typically replaced with *a(a)habban*. *To forbeorene 7 to forlætenne* is thus even further removed from the translator's habitual treatment of its source than is *bewereð 7 forbeodeð*, and suggests an intentional modification of the sense communicated by *abstinere*.

While both *for-beran* and *for-lætan* carry implications of self-deprivation and abstinence, and are thus appropriate to *abstinere*, they are also found expressing other concepts. *For-beran*, for example, is also found glossing *dissimulare* and *sustinere* among other concepts, and carries implications of endurance and suffering, indulgence, disregard, tolerance, and consideration as well as restraint (*DOE*). In the context of the *Libellus* as a whole, we have seen continued emphasis placed on the concept of consideration and balanced judgement over time and according to situation, alongside penitential ideas of suffering and correction. These concepts again receive specific attention later in the response to *Interrogation 5*:

[4.9] In hoc enim tempore sancta ecclesia quaedam per feruorem corrigit, quaedam per mansuetudinem tolerat, quaedam per considerationem

---

<sup>226</sup> "... hence it is necessary that the faithful should only marry relations three or four times removed, while those twice removed must not marry in any case, as we have said." (CM 85)

<sup>227</sup> Therefore it is needful, that Christian men should marry among the third generation or the fourth, because the second generation, that we mentioned before, is in all ways to be abstained and to be abandoned.

**dissimulat**, atque ita portat et dissimulat, ut saepe malum quod aduersatur portando et **dissimulando** conpescat. (CM 84.31-35)<sup>228</sup>

[4.9b] Forðon in þas tid seo halige cirice sumu þing þurh welm receð, sumu þurh monþwærnesse aræfneð, sumu þurh sceawunge ældeð, 7 swa **ábireð 7 ældeð**, þætte oft þæt wiðerworde yfel **abeorende 7 ældend** bewereð. (Miller 70.33-72.3)<sup>229</sup>

*For-beran*, used to partially replace *abstinere* in extract 4.10/4.10b, is also found translating *dissimulare*, here taken as ‘to pass over, concede’ or ‘forbear’ (Latham 152), elsewhere. This translation choice accents a connection between the sense the translator wishes to communicate through *to forbeorene 7 to forlætenne*, and the message of tolerance expressed through *dissimulare*. *A-beran*, used to translate *dissimulare* later in *Interrogation 5*, acknowledges and strengthens this relationship.

As *for-beran* recalls the idea of tolerance and consideration over time alongside the abstinence inferred by *abstinere*, so its partner, *for-lætan*, draws other ideas into the sense of the translator’s replacement here. Where *for-beran* suggests a requirement for understanding of and concession to the laws of the church, *for-lætan* predominantly invokes a sense of abandonment or ‘leaving’ (*DOE*). This sense echoes the translator’s treatment of *continere* in *Interrogation 1*, where he uses his customary replacement for *abstinere*, *ahabban*:

[4.10] Siqui uero sunt clerici extra sacros ordines constituti, qui se **continere** non possunt, sortire uxores debent, et stipendia sua exterius accipere; ... (CM 80.14-16)<sup>230</sup>

---

<sup>228</sup> “For in these days the holy Church corrects some things with zeal and tolerates some things with gentleness, while in her wisdom she connives at other things and so by forbearance and connivance often succeeds in checking the evil which she resists.” (CM 85)

<sup>229</sup> Because in this time the holy Church corrects some things through fervour, some it endures through gentleness, some it ages (temporises) through contemplation, and so bears and ages, so that often bearing and temporising defends against the opposing evil.

<sup>230</sup> “If, however, there are any who are clerics but in minor orders and who cannot be continent they should marry and receive their stipends outside the community” (CM 81)

[4.10b] Gif þonne hwylce preostas 7 Godes þeowas synd butan halgum  
háðum gesette, þa ðe heo from wiifum **ahabban** ne mæge, nimen heom wiif  
7 heora ondleofone utan onfongen. (Miller 64.25-7)<sup>231</sup>

Although *Interrogation* 1's ruling is applied directly to those in religious roles, the exclusion emphasised in the passage above is applied to secular relationships through exclusion from sacred ritual in *Interrogation* 5:

[4.11] Siqui autem perpetraverint, corporis et sanguinis Domini  
communione priuandi sunt, ... (CM 86.2-3)<sup>232</sup>

[4.11b] Gif hwylc þonne ofer þæt gefremmen, þonne seondon heo to  
bescyrienne Cristes lichoman 7 blodes. (Miller 72.5-7)<sup>233</sup>

Here, proscription from the Eucharist prevents the illegally married supplicant from communing with God and Christ if they persist in sexual activity with their spouse. This isolation from church ritual and congregation effectively enacts a psychological punishment similar to that explored in chapter 3, in which a monk's isolation from the collective consciousness of his monastery in burial, and from the benefit of their prayers, impresses the gravity of his failure to correct his lifestyle on readers and hearers of his tale.

Within the *Interrogation* itself, the translator installs directives reinforcing the nature of the behaviour which is to be subject to this punishment. Some of these directives are subtle, such as the series of additions to the OE version (*betweohn, cneoris, bearn, wer ond wiif, gesinscipe*) identified earlier. Around the midpoint of the 'reply', however, the translator performs a more extensive renovation. This renovation centres around Gregory's invocation of Mark 6:18,

---

<sup>231</sup> If then any priests and servants of God placed separate outside holy orders, when they might not live without wives, let them take wives and receive their maintenance outside.

<sup>232</sup> "If any do so, then they shall be deprived of the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord;" (CM 87)

<sup>233</sup> If nevertheless they subsequently do that, then they are to be deprived of the body and blood of Christ.

supporting rulings on marriage between in-laws, for which the *Interrogation* supplies an exegetical explanation of John the Baptist's condemnation and martyrdom:

[4.12] Cum cognata quoque miscere prohibitum est, quia per coniunctionem priorem caro fratris fuerit facta. Pro qua re etiam Iohannes Baptista capite truncatus est et sancto martyrio consummatus, cui non est dictum ut Christum negaret, et pro Christi confessione occisus est; sed quia isdem Dominus noster Iesus Christus dixerat: 'Ego sum ueritas,' quia pro ueritate Iohannes occisus est, uidelicet et pro Christo sanguinem fudit. (CM 84.16-23)<sup>234</sup>

For his version of this passage, the translator departs from his usual practice when rendering biblical references, exemplified twice earlier in *Interrogation* 5 (Miller 70.12-16), of retaining the Latin scriptural quotation and adding his own OE translation. Instead, the scriptural quotation found at the end of the passage—*Ego sum ueritas* (Ioh. 14:16)—is cut entirely, allowing the translator to refocus the exegetical interpretation with which he replaces Gregory's original.

The interpretation which the translator provides for the story of John's martyrdom moves away from the Latin version's philosophical extrapolation of his death as "for the sake of truth", simplifying the passage to associate John's death directly with his condemnation of Herod's decision to marry his brother's wife in a closer reflection of the biblical passage:

<sup>17</sup> Ipse enim Herodes misit, ac tenuit Joannem, et vinxit eum in carcere propter Herodiadem uxorem Philippi fratris sui, quia duxerat eam. <sup>18</sup>  
Dicebat enim Joannes Herodi : Non licet tibi habere uxorem fratris tui. <sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>234</sup> "So also it is forbidden to marry a brother's wife, because by a former union she had become one flesh with his brother, For this reason also John the Baptist was beheaded and won holy martyrdom. He was not bidden to deny Christ nor was he executed for his confession of Christ. But since our Lord Jesus Christ said, 'I am the truth', and John was killed for the sake of the truth, therefore he shed his blood for Christ." (CM 85)

Herodias autem insidiabatur illi : et volebat occidere eum, nec poterat.  
(*Vulgata Clementina* Mark 6:17-19)<sup>235</sup>

[4.12b] Swelce is eac bewered þæt mon hine menge wið his broðorwiife,  
forðon þurh þa ærran geþeodnesse heo wæs geworden his broðor lichoma.  
For þære wiisan eac swilce Iohannes se Baptista wæs heafde becorfen 7  
halige martirdome his liif geendade, þa he þam cyninge sægde, þæt him  
alyfed nære þæt he his broðor wiif brohte 7 hæfde. (Miller 70.18-23)<sup>236</sup>

Although both the Latin and OE texts of *Interrogation* 5 begin by drawing the reader's attention to marriage between blood kin, the translator alters the *Interrogation* to direct the attention of the audience strongly towards the issue of relationships between those related by marriage.

This reconstruction relates the translator's version of *Interrogation* 5 even more effectively with narratives of illegal marriage found in the body of the *HE* itself. In II:V, for example, Bede briefly relates the reign of Eadbald, son and successor of the venerated Æðelberht, king of Kent. This chapter, which details the disintegration of order after the death of a good Christian ruler, presents a moral lesson of rulership, demonstrating the role of the monarch to dictate the behaviour of his people through his own behaviour. The narrative attributes two particular sins to Eadbald, which are the cause not only of disruption of the church and the kingdom, but also of personal suffering:

[4.13] At uero post mortem Aedilbercti, cum filius eius Eadbald regni gubernacula suscepisset, magno tenellis ibi adhuc ecclesiae crementis detrimento fuit. Siquidem non solum fidem Christi recipere noluerat, sed et fornicatione pollutus est tali, qualem nec inter gentes auditam apostolus

---

<sup>235</sup> “<sup>17</sup>For Herod himself had sent and apprehended John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias the wife of Philip his brother, because he had married her. <sup>18</sup>For John said to Herod: It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. <sup>19</sup>Now Herodias laid snares for him: and was desirous to put him to death, and could not.” (Douay-Rheims)

<sup>236</sup> Likewise it is also prohibited that a man mingle with his brother's wife, because through the previous union she was made his brother's body. Likewise, for this matter John the Baptist was also beheaded and ended his life in holy martyrdom, when he said to the king, that it was not allowed that he lead and have his brother's wife.



testatur, ita ut uxorem patris haberet. Quo utroque scelere occasionem dedit ad priorem uomitum reuertendi his qui sub imperio sui parentis, uel fauore uel timore regio, fidei et castimoniae iura susceperant. Nec supernae flagella distictionis perfido regi castigando et corrigendo defuere; nam crebra mentis uaesania et spiritus inmundi inuasionem premebatur. (CM 150.22-32)<sup>237</sup>

[4.13b] Ða wæs æfter Æðelberhtes forðfore, Eadbald his sunu feng to ðam rice, ond he sona micle wonunge 7 æwerdlan wæs þære mærwān cyrican weaxnisse. Forðon nales þæt aan þæt he Cristes geleafan onfon ne wolde, ac swylce eac unalyfedre forlegenesse 7 egeslicre wæs besmiten, swa þæt he eode to his fæder wife. For æghwæðrum þissa mana he intingan sealde þæm, þæt heo hwurfe to þære ærran unclænnisse, þa ðe under his fæder rice oðþe mid þy cynelecan fultome oððe his ege clænnisse reht 7 Cristes geleafon onfengon. Ne þæm treowleasan cyninge þære uplecan þrea sweopon gewon wæron, þæt he þurh þa geclænsed 7 gereht beon sceolde; forðon he gelomlice mid wedenheortnesse modes 7 þæs unclænan gastes inswogennisse þrycced wæs. (Miller 110.22-34)<sup>238</sup>

In this passage, the consequences of inappropriate sexual practice and apostasy (or disregard of the laws and beliefs of the Christian church on the part of a ruler, who should be the exemplar of belief and behaviour for his subjects) are detailed as both personal and public. Internally, the perpetrator suffers insanity (*wedenheortnesse*

---

<sup>237</sup> “But after the death of Æthelberht, when his son Eadbald had taken over the helm of state, there followed a severe setback to the tender growth of the Church. Not only had he refused to receive the faith of Christ but he was polluted with such fornication as the apostle declares to have been not so much as named among the Gentiles, in that he took his father’s wife. By both of these crimes he gave the occasion to return to their own vomit those who had accepted the laws of faith and continence during his father’s reign either out of fear of the king or to win his favour. The apostate king, however, did not escape the scourge of divine punishment in chastisement and correction; for he was afflicted by frequent fits of madness and possessed by an unclean spirit.” (CM 151)

<sup>238</sup> “Then after Æthelberht’s death his son Eadbald succeeded to the throne, and he soon was the cause of great loss and injury to the growth of the tender church; because he not only refused to receive Christ’s faith, but was also polluted with unlawful and fearful fornication, so that he went in to his father’s wife. By both these sins he gave occasion to those to return to their former impurity, who in his father’s reign, either by the royal support or out of fear of him, received the laws of purity and faith in Christ.” (Miller 111)

*modes*) and visitations from an ‘unclean spirit’ (*unclænan gastes*).<sup>239</sup> In the public sphere, Eadbald’s behaviour causes damage within the church, disrupting its development (*he sona micle wonunge 7 æwerdlan wæs þære mærwān cyrican weaxnisse*), and leads to regression on the part of his subjects (*For æghwæðrum ... geleafon onfengon*).

A later chapter, III:XXII, recounts the consequences of association with an illegally married retainer for King Sigebert:

[4.14] Cumque tempore non paucō in praefata prouincia, gaudente rege, congaudente uniuerso populo, uitae caelestis institutio cotidianum sumeret augmentum, contigit ipsum regem instigante omnium bonorum Inimico, propinquorum suorum manu interfici. ... In qua tamen eius morte innoxia, iuxta praedictum uiri Dei, uera est eius culpa punita. Habuerat enim unus ex his, qui eum occiderunt, comitibus illicitum coniugium; quod cum episcopus prohibere et corrigere non posset, excommunicauit eum atque omnibus, qui se audire uellent, praecepit, ne domum eius intrarent neque de cibis illius acciperent. Contempsit autem rex praeceptum, et rogatus a comite intrauit epulaturus domum eius. (CM 284.5-22)<sup>240</sup>

[4.14b] Mid þy þa micelre tide in þære foresprecenan mægðe, gefeóndum þam cyninge 7 efengefeondum allum þam folce, seo gesetenes þæs heofonlican lifes dæghwamlice toecnesse nom, þa gelomp, inbryrdendum þām feonde ealra goda, þæt se cyning þurh his mæga hond wæs ofslegen. ... Hwæðre in þām únsýldgan deaðe wæs his soð syn wítnad æfter forecwide þæs góðan weres þæs halgan biscopes. Forðon oðer þara gesiða, þe þone cyning slogon, hæfde unalyfedne gesinscipe. Ða se biscop þæt þa ne meahhte bewerian ond gereccan, þa amænsumade he hine, 7 eallum bebed, þam þe him hyran woldon, þæt heo in his hus ne eodon, ne of his swæsendum mete

<sup>239</sup> A similar manifestation of impurity is repeated in III:XI, applied to the ‘guest’ of Æðelhild (see chapter 2).

<sup>240</sup> “For a long time the instruction of the people in the heavenly life prospered day by day in the kingdom, to the joy of the king and the whole nation; but it then happened that the king was murdered, at the instigation of the enemy of all good men, by his own kinsmen. ... But nevertheless, by this innocent death a real offence was punished in accordance with the prophesy of the man of God. For one of the gesiths who murdered him was unlawfully married, a marriage which the bishop had been unable to prevent or correct. So he excommunicated him and ordered all who would listen to him not to enter the man’s house nor take food with him. But the king disregarded this command and accepted an invitation of the gesith to dine at his house.” (CM 285)

þege. Ða oferhogode se cyning his gebod; gelaðode se gesið hine to his ham, 7 he hine gesohte 7 in his hus eode, 7 his swæsendo þegde. (Miller 226.29–228.15)<sup>241</sup>

This episode illustrates the consequences of persistence with an inappropriate marriage for the perpetrator, and for a member of the community who endorses an illegal marriage by failing to uphold the exclusion enforced by the Church.

Sigeberht's narrative here provides an effective extension of *Interrogation 5*, in that it demonstrates a situation and punishment of illegal marriage, for both the married person and his community, in a practical scenario.

The translator's attention to the content of *Interrogation 5*, particularly evident in his addition of *cweðan* to open the response and in alterations to the passage invoking the martyrdom of John the Baptist (extracts 4.14/4.14b), suggests that this *Interrogation* and the issues it raises had special significance. Like previous *Interrogations*, the first half of the response to *Interrogation 5* reads like a document of canon law, outlining what degrees of propinquity are and are not allowable in Christian marriage. *Interrogations 4* and *5* are found in the form of two separate *Interrogations* only in the 'Question and Answer' form stemming from Bede's *HE* version. The close relationship this reflects is cemented in the opening of the response to *Interrogation 5*, which presents an extension of *Interrogation 4*'s answer regarding marriage between brothers and sisters (extract 4.1/4.1b). In contrast to the brief, direct response to *Interrogation 4* (extract 4.2/4.2b), however, the issues raised in this question require an expansive, explanatory answer, immediately

---

<sup>241</sup> "Now when for a good while in the aforesaid province the ordinance of heavenly life daily gathered strength, to the joy of the king which was shared by all his people, then it happened, through the instigation of the enemy of all good, that the king was slain by the hand of his kindred. ... Yet in his undeserved death a true sin of his was punished according to the prophecy of the good and holy bishop. For one of those gesiths, who slew the king, was unlawfully wedded; and as the bishop could not prevent and correct this, he excommunicated him and ordered all, who would listen to him, not to enter his house or taste meat at his table. Then the king disregarded his order; the gesith invited him to his house, and he visited him, entered, and partook of his meal." (Miller 229)

suggesting contention surrounding the issues tackled in this more laboured reply. Indeed, the opening statements of *Interrogation 5* express contention in themselves, immediately establishing a juxtaposition between secular and sacred law through opposing references to *terrena lex* (*eorðlice æ*) and *sacra lex* (*halige æ*).

As the document was indeed read as a canon law document, contention over the contents of this first part of *Interrogation 5* appears to have arisen almost immediately after its initial publication, and is preserved in surviving correspondence. The letters of St. Boniface particularly exemplify early consternation over the content and origins of the *responsa*, stemming from alarm over its seemingly contradictory tenets on permitted levels of blood relationship within marriage (Deansley & Grosjean 8). Boniface received an answer from Pope Gregory II in 726 addressing his query regarding the ruling on marriage contained in the *Libellus*, which allows marriage within the third degree. Gregory II's reply refers back to the decision of the *Concilium Romanum* in 721 to allow marriage after the seventh degree, from which material attached to many manuscripts of the *Libellus* qualifying *Interrogation 5* was drawn (Friesen 161–62). This contention continued to plague Boniface, and was followed up in a letter requesting a copy of the document from Nothelm in 736, to verify Gregory's permission of marriages in the third degree in Question Five (*EHD* 745–6). Boniface's letter to Nothelm calls particular attention to questions of authenticity surrounding the *Libellus*, stating that the document could not be found by the *scriniarii* of Rome:

[4.15] Likewise I earnestly beseech that you will take care to send me a copy of that letter in which are contained, as they say, the questions of Augustine, the bishop and first preacher to the English, and the replies of the holy Pope Gregory; in which among other chapters it is stated that the faithful are permitted to marry within the third degree of relationship; and that you will diligently try to investigate with minute care whether or not that document can be proved to be by our above-mentioned father, St. Gregory. For when it was looked for in the archives of the Roman Church, it could not, the custodians assert, be found with the other transcripts of the aforesaid pontiff's writings. (*EHD* 746)

Concern over this issue is also expressed in the *Concilium Romanum* for 743, in which Pope Zachary addresses the lack of documentary evidence for the *Libellus* with particular attention given to Gregory's allowance of marriage in the fourth degree (*MGH, Concilia II. I, 19-21*).

Zachary, although seemingly perplexed by such misalignment, supports the authenticity of the *Libellus* document despite its absence from Lateran records, and finds justification for Gregory I's ruling in the early stage of conversion to the faith for which he was legislating:

[4.16] sed, dum rudes erant et invitandi ad fidem, quamquam minime scriptum, ut dictum est, repperimus, credere non ambigimus. (*MGH, Concilia II. I, 21*)

This attitude is reflected in the second half of the response itself, in which Gregory expands his advice to cater to the particular environment of early Christian England.

Anxiety over the issues raised in *Interrogation 5* continued into the later Christian England of the ninth century, in which the OE translator's version of the *Libellus* was produced. Several items of ninth-century correspondence among and between ecclesiastic and royal governing bodies demonstrate continuing concern over issues of lawful marriage. Pope John VIII's 873/874 letter to King Burgred of Mercia, for example, may refer directly to *Interrogation 5* in its denunciation of Mercian marital and sexual practices:

[4.17] Quoniam, sicut audivimus, fornicationis in vobis peccatum maxime regnat, eo quod sanctimoniales et Deo iam devotas feminas atque de propria consanguinitate homines regni vestri ultra sancti Gregorii statutum novello tunc populo necessario mandatum uxores ducere presumant, ... (*CS 1*)<sup>242</sup>

Between 883 and 890 (*EHD 814*), letters from Fulk, Archbishop in Rheims, appear to include Alfred, too, in the ongoing discourse surrounding marital law. One letter, surviving in full, includes what Whitelock and Brooke perceive as a possible allusion

---

<sup>242</sup> "Since, as we have heard, the sin of fornication is especially rife among you, in that many men of your kingdom presume to marry nuns and women dedicated to God, and women of their own kindred, disregarding the statute of St. Gregory, ..." (*EHD 810*)

to *Interrogation* 5's allowance of marriage within the third and fourth degrees of consanguinity:

[4.18] Augustinus etenim sanctus vestrae gentis primus episcopus, a beato Gregorio apostolo vestro directus, nec omnia decreta apostolicarum sanctionum potuit in brevi demonstrare, nec rudem ac barbaram gentem voluit subito novis et incognitis legibus onerare; noverat enim infirmitati illorum consulere, ... (CS 8)<sup>243</sup>

This passage recalls Pope Zachary's citation of Gregory's habitual consideration of particular circumstances, as explanation for the ruling on degrees of affinity within marriage for the newly converted Anglo-Saxons. However, the passage is retrospective, and Fulk continues to argue for the development of applied canon law alongside its target society, progressing towards perfect observance of Apostolic teachings:

[4.19] Quoniam et rudimenta barbaricae feritatis ad divinam cognitionem enutrienda, hoc solo indigebant; et servi fideles atque prudentes super familiam Domini constituti, conservis suis in tempore, hoc est pro captu audientium, mensuram trytici bene erogare noverant. Ac successu temporis crescent religione Christiana, sancta ecclesia his contenta esse nec voluit nec debuit, sed sumpta forma ab ipsis apostolis, magistris et fundatoribus suis, qui post evangelicam doctrinam ab ipso celesti magistro propagatam atque diffusam, non superfluum et inutile sed commodum et salubre duxerunt suarum epistolarum crebris commonitionibus fideles perfectius instituere, et

---

<sup>243</sup> "Certainly Augustine, the first bishop of your people, sent to you by the blessed Gregory, your Apostle, neither could demonstrate in a short time all the decrees of the apostolic ordinances nor wished suddenly to burden a rude and barbarous race with new and unknown laws; for he knew how to have regard to their weakness, ..." (EHD 814-15)

in fide vera solidius confirmare, tramitemque vivendi et normam religionis eis abundantius contradere. (CS 9)<sup>244</sup>

The translator's reworking of the *Libellus* ostensibly forms part of this development process, making the text accessible to a later audience than that for which it was originally intended.

Later, around 890, another of Fulk's letters to Alfred reported in abstract by Flodoard of Reims, adds again to this tradition of corrective correspondence, confronting rumours of inappropriate Anglo-Saxon sexual practices directly:

[4.20] Albrado regi transmarino amicabiles litteras mittens, grates refert, quia tam bonum virum et devotum ecclesiasticisque regulis congruentem destinaverit episcopum in civitate Cantaburg nomine. Audierat enim, quod perversissimam sectam, paganis erroribus exortam et in illa gente tunc usque relictam, verbi mucrone satageret amputare. Quae secta suggerere videbatur, episcopis et presbiteris subintroductas habere mulieres, ad propinquas quoque generis sui quisque vellet accedere, insuper et sacratas Deo feminas incestare, uxorem habens concubinam simul habere. Quae omnia quam sanae fidei sint adversa, documentis manifestat evidentissimis, ex sanctorum patrum prolatis auctoritatibus. (CS 12-13)<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> "But indeed, the rearing from barbaric and savage beginnings required this alone; and faithful and wise servants, set over the Lord's family, knew well to give their fellow servants their measure of wheat in due season, that is, for the capture of hearers. As time passed and the Christian religion grew, Holy Church would not and had no right to be content with these things, but only with the model received from the Apostles, their masters and founders, who after the propagation and diffusion of the evangelical teaching by the celestial master himself, accounted it not superfluous and useless, but necessary and beneficial, to establish the faithful more perfectly with the frequent admonitions of their letters, and to strengthen them more firmly in the true faith, and to deliver them more abundantly a way of living and pattern of religion." (EHD 815)

<sup>245</sup> "To Alfred, a king across the sea, he sent friendly letters, thanking him that he had appointed a man so good and devout and suitable according to the rules of the Church as bishop in the city called Canterbury. For he had heard that he was concerned to cut down with the sword of the word that most perverse opinion, arisen from pagan errors, until then surviving among that people. This opinion seemed to permit bishops and priests to have women living near them, and anyone, who wished, to approach kinswomen of his own stock, and, moreover, to defile women consecrated to God, and, although married, to have at the same time a concubine. How contrary all these things are to sound faith he shows by most convincing examples and cites in support the authority of the holy fathers." (EHD 813)

Fulk's correspondence with Alfred concerning these matters of correction not only demonstrates the extent to which foreign ecclesiastics took an interest in the English church, but also reveals the extent to which marital practices were at issue.

Behind the correspondences between ecclesiastic leaders and the secular rulers of the Christian English (extracts 4.15–4.20), a second line of correspondence from John VIII and Archbishop Fulk admonished leaders within the English Church. Following up on a lost letter to Alfred, and following a similar line to his earlier letter to Burgred of Mercia, John VIII wrote to the archbishop in Canterbury, Æthelred, around 877 (*EHD* 811). In this letter, the Pope refers to the rulings of Gregory regarding marriage directly, presumably invoking the contents of

*Interrogation 5:*

[4.21] Sed neque de propria cognatione secundum sancti precessoris nostri Gregorii doctoris gentis vestre, decretale statutum cuiquam ducere permittas. (*CS* 5)<sup>246</sup>

Fulk's later correspondence with Alfred was likewise followed up with a letter to the then archbishop, Plegmund, which Floduard again records for us in abstract:

[4.22] Pleonico archiepiscopo transmarino, congratulans bonis eius studiis, quibus eum laborare compererat pro abscidendis et extirpandis incestuosis luxurie fomentis supra in his litteris, quae Albrado regi scripserat, commemoratis, quae in ea gente videbantur inolevisse; sacris eum instruens et armans auctoritatibus censurae canonicae, particeps nimirum piis ipsius laboribus cupiens existere. (*CS* 13)<sup>247</sup>

Together with the evidence in correspondence between ecclesiastic and secular leaders, these letters add to an extended discourse revealing the extent to which Gregory's decrees, laid down as replies to Augustine's questions in the early stages of

---

<sup>246</sup> "Neither are you to permit anyone to marry within his own kindred, by the established decree of our holy predecessor Gregory, the teacher of your race." (*EHD* 812)

<sup>247</sup> [Fulk wrote] "to Plegmund, and archbishop across the sea, congratulating him on his good exertions, by which, he had learnt, he was working to cut off and extirpate the incestuous heats of lasciviousness, mentioned above in the letter which he had written to King Alfred, which would seem to have sprung up in that race; instructing and arming him with the sacred authorities of canonical censure, and desiring truly to be sharer in his pious labours." (*EHD* 813)



England's conversion, remained vital to government of the practices of the ninth-century, Christian English. As an instrument for providing access to an important ecclesiastical text, including Gregory's rulings in response to questions of appropriate behaviour for the Christian English, the Anglo-Saxon translation of the *HE* and the *Libellus*, and the alterations found therein, form an important part of this discourse.

For Alfred and the translator's ninth-century audience, then, the tales of Eadbald and Sigebert (extracts 4.13/4.13b; 4.14/4.14b) and the tenets presented in *Interrogation* 5 had more than an academic relevance. Alfred's contact with the issue of inappropriate marriage began some thirty years before the correspondence regarding marital customs explored above (extracts 4.15-4.22) began to be exchanged. In 858, Alfred's elder brother Æðelbald married Judith, the second wife of his father. Contemporary literature shows Æðelbald's marriage and the issue of lawful union to be a public concern. Asser, for example, records the marriage as "contrary to God's prohibition and the dignity of a Christian, contrary also to the custom of all pagans" (cap. 17):

[4.23] Defuncto autem Aethelwulfo rege <sepulto que apud Wintoniam>, Aethelbald, filius eius, contra Dei interdictum et Christianorum dignitatem, necnon et contra omnium paganorum consuetudinem, thorum patris sui ascendens, Iuthittam, Karoli, Francorum regis, filiam, cum magna ab omnibus audientibus infamia, in matrimonium duxit, effrenisque duobus et dimidio annis Occidentalium Saxonum post patrem regni gubernacula rexit. (Stevenson 16)<sup>248</sup>

The disruption caused by Æðelbald's public display of impiety in marrying his stepmother and thus 'uncovering the flesh' of his father instigates a "need for the re-

---

<sup>248</sup> "When King Æðelwulf was dead [and was buried in Winchester], his son Æðelbald, contrary to the prohibition of God and to the dignity of Christians, and also contrary to the custom of all pagans, ascending to the bed of his father, married Judith, daughter of Charles, king of the Franks, incurring much ill repute from all who heard of it. He ruled over the government of the West Saxons for two and a half unbridled years after (the death of) his father." (Smyth, 11)

establishment of proper social order” (Rowley 92).<sup>249</sup> Pope John VIII highlights the relevance of Gregory’s instructions on these matters in his letter to Archbishop Æðelred (extract 4.21).

The translator’s treatment of *Interrogation 5* and the *Libellus* within the *HE*, and the historical detail available with which to cross-reference the issues raised therein, provides a model of the function of the translated *Libellus* text as a didactic tool. Many of the translator’s alterations to *Interrogation 5* relate the contents of the *Interrogation* to situations found elsewhere in the *HE* narrative, particularly those dealing with the issues concerning marriage Gregory addresses in his response. By placing the *Libellus* after demonstrative narratives of illegal marriage, such as that involving Sigebert in Book III, the OE translator allows the text to act as a tool in reconstruction of social and moral order following disruption. The increased proximity between the *Libellus* and this chapter (III:XXII) encourages the reader to make such connections, allowing the rulings of *Interrogation 5* to interact with the penitential content of Sigebert’s episode. Simultaneously, as Rowley argues, the upheaval of social order effected by the ninth-century marriage between Æðelbald and his stepmother, Judith, and the concern reflected in ninth-century papal and official correspondence, connects the contents of *Interrogation 5* and its parallels in the narrative of the *HE* to contemporary issues. The relationships between *Interrogation 5*, the *HE* narrative, and ninth-century events demonstrate the moralising power of the *Libellus* (in its new position) to reach the new audience for Bede’s *HE* with which the translator was faced, and thus highlight the function of the *Libellus* within the translator’s moral structure and agenda for the work.

---

<sup>249</sup> Stevenson notes that despite a statement that Æðelbald separated from Judith after only a very short marriage, Frankish contemporary evidence of her return from England after his death, “wherein she is described as his relict”, suggests that their marriage was allowed to continue (212-13).

## Conclusion

By preferring to restore the *Libellus* to its original position in Book I, editors of the OE *Bede* so far have unanimously downplayed the OE translator's agency in effecting the position of the *Interrogations* in MS copies of his *HE*. Sharon Rowley, however, drew attention to the possibility that the translator may not only have consciously repositioned the *Libellus*, but may also have done so with a particular agenda in mind. This thesis has considered that possibility in reference to the moralising agenda appropriated and emphasised in the translator's version of Bede's preface to the *HE*. Many of the subtle alterations effected by 'doublings' within the *Libellus* work alongside larger changes to support such a moralising agenda. The rhetorical effect of these changes on the text of the *Libellus* then extends outwards into the content surrounding the translator's new position for the text within the *HE*, interacting with moralistic episodes in the narrative of the work and integrating the *Libellus* into its moral framework. The resulting penitential rhetoric encompasses episodes of the *HE* text which relate directly to the content of the *Libellus*, and then to events relevant to the ninth-century society which provided the translator with his audience. In this way, the translator's augmentation and revision of the moralism already present in the Latin *Libellus* text, and his assimilation of that text into the moral worlds of both his source text and his ninth-century readers, update Bede's *Libellus* so that the moral agenda expressed in the *HE* preface has relevance to, and impact for, its new audience.

Although other agendas are implied through the nature and content of both Bede's and the translator's versions of the *HE*, the translator makes a moralistic agenda, based on demonstration through past lives, the primary stated intent for the work through his changes to the preface (see extract 3.1/3.1b). For the reader, then, other motivations the translator may have had for composing his translation of the *HE* must operate as subsidiary to this stated agenda.

Amendments the translator makes to the *Libellus*, a text which commonly shares manuscript context with penitential material, reflect the didactic preoccupation the preface expresses. As Chapter 2 examined, over half the small changes in sense effected by “doublings”, a stylistic feature characteristic of the translator’s idiosyncratic style, within the *Libellus* translation emphasise ideas connected to the concept of moral improvement. In particular, many of these doublings promote a process of balancing worldly and spiritual concerns to achieve an ideal Christian lifestyle, and thus to earn salvation in the heavenly realm. Such changes reflect Gregory’s conception of *consideratio*, and encourage readers to correct their behaviour to achieve an ideal of clean living outlined in *Interrogation 1*:

[2.15] De eorum quoque stipendio cogitandum atque prouidendum est, et sub ecclesiastica regula sunt tenendi, ut bonis **moribus** uiuant et canendis psalmis inuigilent, et ab omnibus inlicitis et cor et linguam et corpus Deo auctore conseruent (CM 80.18-22)<sup>250</sup>

[2.15b] Swylce eac be heora ondlifne is to þencenne 7 to foreseonne, þæt heo godum **þeawum** lifgen under cirlecum regole 7 sealmas to singenne 7 wæccan to bigongenne, 7 from eallum unalyfednessum heora heortan 7 tungan 7 lichoman Gode ælmihtegum clæne healden. (Miller 66.3-7)<sup>251</sup>

The subtle changes enacted through the translator’s doublings interact with larger ones within the *Libellus*, such as excisions, additions, or rephrasing of passages, to augment the didactic quality of that text. During his translation of the *Libellus*, therefore, the translator appears to have applied particular consideration to promoting the penitential, moralistic nature of the *Libellus* text.

Although the *Libellus* is an imported document and thus may stand apart from the *HE* narrative, the translator’s augmentation of its moralistic character, and

---

<sup>250</sup> Care must also be taken and provision made for their stipends and they must be kept under ecclesiastical rule, living a moral life and staying awake for singing of psalms, and keeping body and tongue and heart from all things unlawful under the authority of God.

<sup>251</sup> Likewise also about their living is to be considered and to be reasoned, so that they live in good customs under Church rule and sing psalms and wake to worship, and from all things unlawful hold their hearts and tongues and bodies clean for God almighty.

the continuity of his individual style throughout the entire *HE* text, serve to integrate the *Libellus* further into the fabric of the Old English *HE* as a whole. The intensified penitential undertone of the OE *Libellus*, and its interaction with the many morally instructive episodes found throughout the *HE* text, represent another level of this integration. These factors work to assimilate the *Libellus* into the moral structure of the *HE*. Chapter 3's examination of possible relationships between the *Libellus*' content and that of episodes of moral value within the *HE* suggested that ideas which caught the translator's interest during translation of the *Libellus* (as reflected in his vocabulary choices) also recur most often in these final three books. The translator's placement of the *Libellus* at the moral and structural apex of his *HE*, between Books Three and Four, encourages the content of the *Libellus* and its penitential function to interact with the morally saturated narratives of the *HE*'s later books, and thus with the objective outlined in the translator's version of the *HE* preface. This interaction justifies the placement of the *Libellus* amongst these features in the final three books of the *HE*.

The OE translation of the *HE* and the translator's amendments to the *Libellus* and Bede's text reflect a drive to update a source text, in order to reach a new audience and to communicate the translator's intended messages and agendas. As Chapter 4 considered, the content and heritage of *Interrogation 5* provide a suggestion of the potential importance of the *Libellus*' penitential content to the translator and this "new audience", his ninth-century readership. The translator's alterations to his source text for *Interrogation 5*, like those made to other *Interrogations*, co-operate with narrative elsewhere in the *HE* to promote the moral agenda of the text. Further, the content of *Interrogation 5*, and evidence of concern over the issues of consanguinity it raises which is preserved in correspondence of the ninth century and earlier, provide a window onto the *Libellus* text's interaction with ninth-century events and discourse. *Interrogation 5* mediates between episodes addressing illegal marriage in the *HE* narrative and real-life examples of such

marriages, such as that between Æðelbald and Judith, to reinforce the ongoing relevance of the *Libellus* in the establishment and maintenance of moral standards. Simultaneously, the position of *Interrogation* 5 within the translator's *Libellus* encourages the reader to associate it with penitential content in the *HE* along with its fellow *Interrogations*. As Rowley's "Shifting Contexts" has argued, the translator's new placement of Gregory's *Libellus* thus invites a ninth-century audience to utilise parallels between penitential narratives in the *HE* and the penitential content of the *Libellus*, and to apply Gregory's instructions to reassert social and moral strictures in their own period.

The translator's treatment of the *Libellus* text, including his removal of the text from its chronological place in Book I to a new position after Book III, forms part of the rhetorical fabric of the translator's version of the *HE*, and works to promote the moralistic agenda expressed in the OE version of its preface. Subtle amendments, such as the use of rhetorical *hendiadys* through 'doubling', function with larger alterations to the *Libellus* text to revise and augment its moralistic force. The messages promoted in the translator's new version of the *Libellus* are then assimilated into those expressed in moralistic narrative episodes surrounding the text's new position in the *HE*. Finally, such narrative episodes which depict the kind of illegal marriage legislated for in *Interrogation* 5 relate directly to the content of the *Libellus*, and connect this *Interrogation* and the *HE*'s narrative depictions of the transgressions it describes with events and discourse surrounding such marriages in the ninth-century world. This rhetorical framework supports the preface's didactic, moral agenda, and is symptomatic of the translator's need to update Bede's *HE* so that it is relevant in a new social and political climate. In its revised form and position in the OE Bede, the *Libellus* assists the translator to communicate effectively a need for moral improvement and penitential vigilance to the *HE*'s new, ninth-century audience.

## Bibliography

### *Primary Texts, Editions and Translations*

- Arngart, O. S. *The Leningrad Bede: An Eighth Century Manuscript ...* (facsimile). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1952.
- Attenborough, F. L., ed. *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1922.
- Bately, J. *The Tanner Bede: The Old English version of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica* (facsimile). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1992.
- Bolton, W. F., ed. *An Old English Anthology*. London: Arnold, 1963.
- Colgrave, B. and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- Haddan, A. W. and W. Stubbs, eds. *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland 3: The English Church 595-1066*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1871.
- Hecht, Hans, ed. *Bischofs Waerferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 5. Leipzig: G.H. Wigand, 1900-7.
- Hunter Blair, P. *The Moore Bede: Cambridge University Library MS KK. 5.16* (facsimile). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1959.
- Martyn, John R. C., trans. *The Letters of Gregory the Great*. 3 vols. Toronto: PIMS, 2004.
- Miller, Thomas, ed. *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of The English People*. EETS o.s. 95, 96, 110, 111. London: Oxford UP, 1890-1, 1898.
- Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (digital) <http://www.dmgh.de/>
- Plummer, Charles, ed. *Venerabilis Bedæ: Historiam Ecclesiasticam Gentis Anglorum etc.* 2 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1896; repr. 1 vol. 1975.
- Schipper, Jacob, ed. *König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 4. Leipzig: G.H. Wigand, 1897.
- Sedgfield W. J. *Anglo-Saxon Prose-book*. Manchester : Manchester UP, 1928.

- Shulte, R. and J. Biguenet. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Smith, J., ed. *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Gentis Anglorum Libri Quinque, Auctore Sancto & Venerabili Bæda*. Cantabrigiæ : Typis Academicis, 1722. (ECCO)
- Smyth, Alfred P. trans. *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Stevenson, William Henry, ed. *Asser's Life of King Alfred*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.
- Sweet, Henry, ed. *King Alfred's West Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. EETS o.s. 45, 50. London: Oxford UP, 1871.
- . *Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1876.
- Symons, Thomas, ed. *Regularis Concordia*. London: Nelson, 1953.
- Wheelock, Abraham, ed. *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Gentis Anglorum Libri V*. Cantabrigiæ: Ex officina Rogeri Daniel ... Prostant Londini apud Cornelium Bee ..., 1644. (EEBO)
- Whitelock, D. ed. *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse*. 15<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford:Clarendon, 1967.
- . *English Historical Documents c. 500-1042*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955.
- . et al. *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church 1:A.D. 871-1204*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

### ***Dictionaries, Grammars, and Concordances***

- Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1882-98. Supplement by T. N. Toller. Oxford, 1908-21; repr. with revised and enlarged addenda by A. Campbell, 1972.
- Cameron, A. et. al. *Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form*. CD-ROM. Toronto: PIMS, 1986-.
- Clark Hall, J. R. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1960.
- Ekwall, E. *The Concise Dictionary of English Place Names*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1936.



- Glare, P. G. W., ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Latham, R. E. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. London: Oxford UP, 1975-89.
- . *Revised Medieval Latin Word List from British and Irish Sources*. London: Oxford UP, 1965.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879; repr. 1975.
- Marchant, J. R. V., J. F. Charles rev. *Cassell's Latin Dictionary*. London: Cassell, 1946.
- Niermeyer, J. F. *A Medieval Latin - French/English Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Nowell, L. *Vocabularium Saxonicum*. Ed. Albert H. Marckwardt. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1952.
- Jones, Putnam Fennell. *A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede*. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy/Concordance Society, 1929.
- Roberts, J. et. al. *A Thesaurus of Old English*. (2 vols) London: KCLMS, 1995.
- Sonnenschein, E. A. *A New Latin Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1915.
- Stelton, L. F. *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Tucker, T. G. *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Latin*. Halle: Niemeter, 1931.

### *Secondary Texts*

- Bately, J. "Old English prose before and during the reign of Alfred." *Anglo-Saxon England* 17 (1988): 93-138.
- . "The Alfredian Canon Revisited: One Hundred Years On." *Alfred the Great*. Ed. Timothy Reuter. Aldershot, Hants: Ashcroft, 2003. 107-120.
- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen, 1980.
- Bean, Marion C. *Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Barnes, 1983.

- Berlin, G. I. "Bede's Miracle Stories: Notions of Evidence and Authority in Old English History." *Neophilologus* 74 (1990): 434-43.
- Blair, John. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Blair, Peter Hunter. *The World of Bede*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Bolton, W. F. "Pre-Conquest Latin: Perspectives and Prospects." *Comparative Literature* 23 (1971): 151-66.
- Bonner, Gerald. "Bede and Medieval Civilization." *Anglo-Saxon England* 2 (1973): 71-90.
- . *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration* ... . London: SPCK, 1976.
- Brown, G. Hardin *Bede the Venerable*. Boston: Twayne, 1987.
- Carver, Martin, ed. *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300*. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2003.
- Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Darlington, R. R. "Ecclesiastical Reform in the Late Old English Period." *The English Historical Review* 51 (1936): 385-428.
- Davidoff, L. "Gender and the 'Great Divide': Public and Private in British Gender History." *Journal of Women's History* 15 (2003): 11-27.
- Davis, R. "Bede's Early Reading." *Speculum* 8 (1933): 179-95.
- Davis, Kathleen. "The Performance of Translation Theory in King Alfred's National Literary Program." *Manuscript, Narrative, Lexicon: Essays on Literary and Cultural Transmission in Honour of Whitney F. Bolton*. Ed. Robert Boening and Kathleen Davis. London: Associated UPs, 2000. 149-170.
- Deansley, M. and P. Grosjean, "The Canterbury Edition of the Answers of Pope Gregory I to St. Augustine." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 10 (1959): 1-49.
- DeGregorio, Scott. "'Nostrorum Socordiam Temporum': The Reforming Impulse of Bede's Later Exegesis." *Early Medieval Europe* 11 (2002): 107-122.

- Discenza, N. Guenther. "The Old English Bede and the Construction of Anglo-Saxon Authority." *Anglo-Saxon England* 31 (2002): 69-80.
- . "The Paradox of Humility in the Alfredian Translations." *Neophilologica* 75 (2003): 44-52.
- . "The Influence of Gregory the Great on the Alfredian Social Imaginary." *Rome and the North*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr. et al. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2001. 67-81.
- Donovan, Leslie A. *Women Saints' Lives in Old English Prose*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1999.
- Dresher, Bezalel E. *Old English and the Theory of Phonology*. New York: Garland, 1985.
- Echard, S., and G. R. Wieland, eds. *Anglo-Latin and Its Heritage*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.
- Evans, G. R. *The Thought of Gregory the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Flint, Valerie I. J. "Space and Discipline in Early Medieval Europe." *Medieval Practices of Space*. Ed. B. Hanawalt and M. Kobialka. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000. 149-166.
- Foot, S. "Parochial Ministry in Early Anglo-Saxon England: The Role of Monastic Communities." *Studies in Church History* 26 (1989): 43-54.
- . "Unveiling Anglo-Saxon Nuns." *Women and Religion in Medieval England*. Ed. D. Wood. Oxford: Oxbow, 2003. 13-31.
- Frantzen, Allen J. *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1990.
- . "The Form and Function of the Preface in the Poetry and Prose of King Alfred's Reign." *Alfred the Great*. Ed. Timothy Reuter. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2003. 121-136.
- Friesen, B. "Answers and Echoes: The *Libellus Responsum* and the Hagiography of the North-western European Mission." *Early Medieval Europe* 14 (2006): 153-172.

- Fry, D. K. "Bede Fortunate in his Translator: The Barking Nuns." *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: Sixteen Original Contributions*. Ed. P. E. Szarmach. Albany NY: SUNY P, 1986.
- Godden, Malcolm. "King Alfred's Preface and the Teaching of Latin in Anglo-Saxon England." *English Historical Review* 117 (2002): 596-604.
- Godfrey, John. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.
- Goffart, Walter. *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A. D. 550-800)*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.
- Grant, Raymond J. S. "Laurence Nowell's Transcript of BM Cotton Otho B.xi." *Anglo-Saxon England* 3 (1974): 111-124.
- . *The B Text of the Old English Bede: A Linguistic Commentary*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989.
- Hanning, Robert W. "Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*: Brittannia Renovata." *The Vision of History in Early Britain from Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth*. New York: Columbia UP, 1966. 63-90.
- Harris, Stephen J. *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. London: Taylor, 2003.
- Hart, J. M. "Rhetoric in the Translation of Bede." *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnival*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1901. 150-4.
- Hayworth, Melanie. "Be Rihtre Æwe: Legislating and Regulating Marital Morality in Late Anglo-Saxon England." PhD Thesis. U of Sydney, 2005.
- Hennesey Olsen, A. "'De Historiis Sanctorum': A Generic Study of Hagiography." *Genre* 13 (1980): 407-29.
- Higham, N. J. *An English Empire: Bede and the Early Anglo-Saxon Kings*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.
- . *Re-Reading Bede: The Ecclesiastical History in Context*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Hill, David. *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

- Hill, J. "Learning Latin in Anglo-Saxon England: Traditions, Texts and Techniques." *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*. Ed. Sarah Rees Jones. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003. 7-29.
- Hipshon, David. "Gregory the Great's 'Political Thought'." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002), 439-453.
- Hollis, Stephanie. *Anglo-Saxon Women and the Church: Sharing a Common Fate*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992.
- Howe, Nicholas. *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.
- Jones, P. F. *A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede*. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1929.
- Karkov, C. E. "The Body of St. Æthelthryth: Desire, Conversion and Reform in Anglo-Saxon England." *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300*. Ed. Martin Carver. Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2003. 397-411.
- Ker, N. R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.
- Keskiaho, J. "The Handling and Interpretation of Dreams and Visions in Late Sixth- to Eighth-century Gallic and Anglo-Latin Hagiography and Histories." *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (2005): 227-48.
- Kuhn, S. M. "Synonyms in the Old English Bede." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46 (1947): 168-76.
- Lapidge, Michael, et al., eds. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Lees, C. A. "Engendering Religious Desire: Sex, Knowledge, and Christian Identity in Anglo-Saxon England." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27 (1997): 17-46.
- . "Signifying Gender and Empire." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34 (2004): 1-16.

- Lees, C. A. and G. R. Overing. *Double Agents: Women and Clerical Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001.
- . "Before History, Before Difference: Bodies, Metaphor and the Church in Anglo-Saxon England." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 11 (1998): 315-334.
- . *Double Agents: Women and Clerical Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001.
- Lerer, Seth. *Literacy and Power in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1991.
- Lingard, J. *The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. London: Thomas Baker, 1858.
- Luecke, J. "The Unique Experience of Anglo-Saxon Nuns." *Medieval Religious Women 2: Peaceweavers*. Ed. J. A. Nichols and L. T. Shank. Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1984 - 92. 55-65.
- Mayr-Harting, H. M. R. E. *The Venerable Bede, The Rule of St. Benedict, and Social Class*. Jarrow Lecture, 1976.
- Meyvaert, Paul. "Bede's text of the *Libellus Responsionum* of Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury." *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, Ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971. 15-33.
- Minnis, A. J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar, 1984.
- Moreira, I. "Dreams and Divination in Early Medieval Canonical and Narrative Sources: The Question of Clerical Control." *Catholic Historical Review* 89 (2003): 621-42.
- Murphy, M. "Abraham Wheloc's Edition of Bede's History in Old English." *Studia Neophilologica* 39(1967): 46-59.
- Orton, P. "Sticks or Stones? The Story of Imma in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS ..." *Medium Aevum* 72 (2003): 1-12.

- Owen, W. B. "The Influence of the Latin Syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1869-1896) 13 (1882): 59-64.
- Palmer, R. B. "Bede as Textbook Writer: A Study of His *De Arte Metrica*." *Speculum* 34:4 (1959), 573-84.
- Potter, S. "On the Relation of the Old English Bede to Werferth's Gregory and to Alfred's Translations." *Mémoires de la Société royale des sciences de Bohême* (1930): 1-76.
- Pratt, David. *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Rabassa, Gregory. "No Two Snowflakes are Alike: Translation as Metaphor." *The Craft of Translation*, Ed. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1989. 1-12.
- Redinbo, Emily Cooney. *Reception, Revision and Sacred Authority: A Literary Analysis of the Old English Bede*. PhD Thesis. Cornell U, 1995.
- Rees Jones, Sarah, ed. *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Rener, Frederick M. *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*. Approaches to Translation Studies 8. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989.
- Rosenthal, J. T. "Bede's Ecclesiastical History and the Material Conditions of Anglo-Saxon Life." *Journal of British Studies*. 19 (1979): 1-17.
- Rowley, S. M. "Reassessing Exegetical Interpretations of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*." *Literature and Theology* 17 (2003): 227-43.
- . "Shifting Contexts: Reading Gregory the Great's *Libellus Responsionum* in Book III of the Old English Bede." *Rome and the North*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr. et al. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2001. 83-92.
- Scragg, D. G. "Source Study." *Reading Old English Texts*. Ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 39-58.

- Sheppard, A. "The King's Family: Securing the Kingdom in Asser's *Vita Alfredi*." *Philological Quarterly* 80 (2001): 409-439.
- St. Jacques, R. C. "Hwylum Word be Worde, Hwylum Andgit of Andgiete'? Bede's Ecclesiastical History and its Old English Translator." *Florilegium* 5 (1985): 85-104.
- Stanton, Robert. *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: Brewer, 2002.
- Stubbs, W. "Beda, Historian." *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines*. Eds. William Smith and Henry Wace. London: Murray, 1877-87. 302.
- Szarmach, Paul E. and Joel Thomas Rosenthal, eds. *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan UP, 1997.
- Thacker, Alan. "Bede's Ideal of Reform." *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society*. Ed. Patrick Wormald. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. 130-153.
- Thompson, A. Hamilton, ed. *Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings; Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of His Death*. New York: Russell, 1966.
- Timofeeva, Olga. "Word be Worde Andgit of Andgite: A Study of the Medieval Rhetorical Formula." *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*, R. W. McConchie et al. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings, 2006. 135-42.
- Van Draat, P. Fijn. "Voluptas Aurium." *Englische Studien* 48 (1914-15): 394-428.
- . "The Cursus in Old English Poetry." *Anglia* 38 (1914): 377-404.
- . "The Authorship of the Old English Bede: A Study in Rhythm." *Anglia* 39 (1915-16): 319-146.
- Ward, Benedicta. *The Venerable Bede*. London: Chapman, 1990.
- Waite, G. "The Vocabulary of the Old English Bede." PhD Thesis: U of Toronto, 1984.
- . *Old English Prose Translations of King Alfred's Reign*. Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature 6. Cambridge: Brewer, 2000.



- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. *Early Germanic kingship in England and on the continent: The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1970*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- . *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Historical Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Whitelock, D. *From Bede to Alfred*. London: Variorum, 1980.
- Wormald, Patrick. "The Age of Bede and Aethelbald." *The Anglo-Saxons*. Ed. James Campbell. London: Penguin, 1991. 70-100.
- Yorke, Barbara. *Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Seaby, 1990.

## Appendices

### *APPENDIX A—List of doublings found translating single words in the*

#### *OE version of the Libellus*

The location given in the far right-hand column refers to the page and line number of the doubling as reproduced in Miller's edition of the Old English version of Bede's *HE*. The figure in square brackets denotes the *Interrogation* in which the doubling is found. An asterisk indicates Latin vocabulary concorded in Appendix B.

#### *Related to Mental Processes: Learning, thought, deliberation*

sprece 7 geþeahhte	agere	72.25 [7]
þoncmeotunge 7 þreodunge	deliberatione*	88.4 [9]
dihtað 7 findeð	dictat*	68.16 [3]
oncneowon 7 ongeton	didicimus*	70.6 [5]
lærde 7 cwæð	docente*	66.12 [1]
tydde 7 lærde	erudire *	64.12 [1]
getýd 7 gelæred	erudita*	64.19 [1]
moodo 7 monna	mentium*	78.34 [8]
weotan 7 leorniað	novimus*	78.10 [8]
to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne	pensandum*	84.3 [8]
þynceð 7 bet licað	placet*	66.19 [2]

#### *Purity, impurity, cleansing*

bæðes 7 þweales	lavacri*	82.2 [8]
aðwegen 7 bebaðad	lavare*	80.26 [8]
apwegen 7 bibaðod	lotus*	80.23 [8]
apwegen 7 bibaðod	lotus*	84.18 [8]
bismitenes ... 7 unclænes	pollutae*	80.14 [8]
unclæne 7 besmiten	pollutum*	80.13 [8]

### *Behaviour and lifestyle*

þeaw 7 gewunan	consuetudinem*	66.18 [2]
drohtian 7 don	conversari*	64.13 [1]
drohtian 7 lifgan	conversentur*	64.6-7 [1]
þas drohtunge 7 þis liif	hanc conversationem*	64.21-22 [1]
máán ... 7 godfrecnis	facinus	70.12 [5]

### *Penance, suffering, discipline, correction*

to onbærnenne 7 to gebetenne	accendendus*	74.2-3 [7]
þreageað 7 swencað	adfligunt*	68.12 [3]
gerehte 7 gebette	corrigantur*	74.1 [7]
(þæt hi) wepen 7 hreowe (don)	defleant*	82.27-8 [8]
þeodscipes ond þrea	disciplinae*	74.2 [7]
þreageað 7 swingað	feriunt*	68.11 [3]
goiende 7 geomriende	gemebat*	88.17 [9]
gooung 7 sár	gemitus*	76.15 [8]
goað 7 geomrað	ingemiscat*	88.15 [9]
eahtan 7 witnian	insequi*	68.14-15 [3]
sár 7 wiite	peonam*	76.18-19 [8]
ne (sculon) bescerian ne beneoman	privare*	72.23-4 [6]

### *Social identity*

preostas 7 Godes þeowas	clerici	64.25 [1]
broðra 7 Godes þeowa	fratrum	80.32 [8]
gæsta 7 cumena	—	64.17 [1]

### *Speak, command, forbid, petition, pray*

areccende 7 cwæð	exponens*	80.11 [8]
------------------	-----------	-----------

senden 7 geoten	fundant	72.19 [6]
hæse 7 bebodum	iussioni	74.4 [7]
bene 7 gebedo	preces	72.19 [6]
bewereð 7 forbeodeð	prohibet*	70.8 [5]
underðeodde 7 æftercwæð	subiungere*	82.32 [8]

### *Other*

to forbeorene 7 to forlætenne	abstinere*	70.11-12 [5]
(moston) onfoon 7 þicgan	accipere	84.14-15 [8]
onfoon ne þycgan mostan	(non) accipere	84.16 [8]
becumen 7 gelæded	adducta/perducta*	64.21 [1]
in gesomnung 7 in gewitscipe	adregatis	72.17 [6]
heardor 7 strongor	districtus*	68.6 [3]
to reccenne 7 to sellenne	erogandum	66.11 [1]
hire untrymnes onweg gewat 7 heo wæs hal geworden	sua infirmitas recessit	78.13-14 [8]
nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse	non ex furore*	68.7 [3]
to gebeorene 7 to gefremmenne	offerenda	76.25 [8]
se mæsta ... 7 se hehsta	praecipuus*	88.16 [9]
to edneowunge 7 to bóte	reparandis	64.18 [1]
growan ne weaxan	succrescere	70.7 [5]
brohte 7 hæfde	—	70.23 [5]

## *APPENDIX B—Latin/OE Concordances of Doubled Latin Vocabulary*

### *Examined in Chapter 2*

Figures in square brackets indicate the location of the vocabulary instance in editions of the Latin and Old English texts, and are present page number followed by line number thus: [CM/*BOH*]; [Miller]. Asterisks denote passages deleted for the OE *Libellus* and isolated in Appendix C.

<i>Headword</i>	<i>Form &amp; Location (Latin)</i>		<i>Translation &amp; Location</i>
abstineo	abstineant	1:27 [84.26/51.19]	ahebban [70.27]
	abstineat	2:11	NT: Excised letter Boniface-Æðelburh
		5:6 [466.13/289.28]	áhebbe [400.7]
	abstinendo	4:25 [422.26/263.28]	fæstan [350.30]
	abstinendum	1:27 [94.37/57.31]	ahaabbenne [82.6]
	abstinere	1:27 [84.11/51.3]	to forbeorene 7 to forlætene
			[70.11-12]
		1:27 [90.9/54.23]	áhabban [76.8]
		1:27 [94.35/57.29]	áhabban [82.3]
		1:27 [98.2/59.7]	ahæfde [84.5]
		1:27 [100.5/60.18]	ahabban [86.18]
accendo	accenendum	5:23 [556.22-3/349.12]	NT: Edited passage [476.15]
	accenendus	1:27 [86.37/53.5]	to onbærnenne 7 to gebettenne [74.2-3]
	accendens	1:6 [26.21-2/17.17]	NT: Truncated chapter [32]
		2:17 [194.5/118.30]	onbærnende [146.10]
	accenderant	3:16 [262.20/159.19]	(þe þæt fyr) ældon 7 bærndon [202.19]
	accenderet	2:2 [136.20/82.12]	onbærnde [100.9]
		5:7 [410.19/293.5]	onbærnde [406.8]
	accendi	4:29 [440.12/274.19]	onbærned [370.27]
	accendit	3:25	NT: Excised chapter
	accendite	4:8 [358.21/221.19]	bærnað [286.20]
	accenditur	Pref. [2.15/5.17]	NT: Edited passage
	accensa	4:8 [358.21/221.10]	onbærned [286.13]

accensi		4:14		NT: Excised chapter
		4:22	[404.23/252.4]	bærnde [330.17]
		4:24	[414.30/259.4]	onbærnde [342.11]
	accenso	2:13	[184.1/112.9]	onæled [134.27]
		3:10	[244.18/147.14]	onæled [180.26]
	accensus	1:15	[52.10/32.15]	Edited passage [52.23–27]
		4:24	[418.24/261.14]	onbærned [346.20]
	adfligo	adflicti	3:27 [312.25/192.29]	swencte [242.19]
		adflictum	1:9	NT: Excised chapter
		adflictus	3:7 [236.2/141.14]	swenced [170.17]
adfligo	adfligunt	adfligunt	1:27 [82.19/50.12]	þreageað 7 swencað [68.12]
		affligat	1:28	NT: Excised letter Gregory-Vergilius
	affligat		4:25 [426.22/266.11]	swence 7 wecce [356.15]
		affligi	1:6 [28.4/17.21]	yfeledon [34.1] ( <i>yfeledon 7 slogan: affligi interficique</i> )
	consuetudo	consuetudine	1:27 [88.23/53.31]	gewunan [74.17]
			1:27 [90.32/55.13]	gewunum [76.34]
			1:27 [94.1/56.23]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [80.3]*
			1:27 [94.4/56.26]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [80.3]*
			3:2 [216.15/130.1]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>est autem ... pugnaturus statueret</i> ) [156.12]
		consuetudinem	5:21	NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
			1:25 [72.17/45.5]	( <i>consuetudinem aestimationis</i> ) æhte [56.29]
			1:27 [80.32/49.23]	þeaw 7 gewunan [66.18]
			1:27 [82.6/49.32]	gewunan [66.27]
			1:27 [92.2/55.18]	gewunan [78.2]
			3:2 [216.10/129.29]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>est autem ... pugnaturus statueret</i> ) [156.12]
			3:5 [226.27/136.19]	gewunan [162.10]
			3:12 [250.26/151.26]	gewunan [188.12]
			3:23 [286.31/175.31]	gewuna [232.3]
			3:25	NT: Excised chapter
			4:25 [422.9/263.9]	wunan [350.12]

		5:19	[522.3/325.20]	gewunan [456.22]
	consuetudines	1:27	[80.29/49.19]	gewunan [66.15]
	consuetudini	2:2	[138.22/83.14]	gewunan [102.9]
		5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	consuetudinis	4:27	[432.9-10/269.15]	gewunan [362.9]
	consuetudo	1:27	[80.29/49.19]	gewuna [66.16]
		1:27	[90.28/55.8]	gewuna [76.28]
		1:27	[92.11/55.29]	gewuna [78.19]
		1:27	[92.31/56.16]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [80.3]*
		3:26		NT: Excised chapter
conversor	conversari	1:27	[80.4/48.22]	drohtian 7 don [64.14]
		2:1	[122.23-4/74.6]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	conversata	4:23	[406.5/252.23]	drohtierende [322.2]
	conversatus	2:1	[124.24/75.3]	NT: Excised passage [94]
		4:25	[426.16/266.4]	lifde [356.8]
		4:28	[438.11/273.9]	NT: Excised passage [368]
		5:6	[464.29/289.8]	drohtigende [398.16]
	conversentur	1:27	[78.18/48.15]	drohtian 7 lifgan [64.6]
conversatio	conversatio	3:26		NT: Excised chapter
		4:6	[354.15/218.17]	lif 7 drohtunge [280.31]
		5:13	[498.15/311.4]	his drohtunge 7 his lif [436.21]
	conversatione	2:4	[146.21/88.4]	NT: Excised letter Laurence et al.-Irish
		2:11		NT: Excised Chapter
		3:19	[276.1/168.2]	drohtunge [218.9]
		4:6	[354.10/218.11]	drohtunge [280.28]
		4:11		NT: Subtitle cut
		4:23	[412.17/257.7]	( <i>monachica conversatione</i> ) munuchade [340.4]
		5:6	[468.34/292.8]	drohtunge [404.15]
		5:12	[488.15/304.13]	liife [424.4]
		5:12	[498.13/310.33]	lifes [436.18]
	conversationem	1:27	[80.11/48.31]	þas drohtunge 7 þis lif [64.22]
		4:23	[414.21/258.22]	NT: Excised passage [342]

		4:27	[434.14/270.27]	drohtunge [364.26]
		4:27	[434.19/270.34]	NT: Ref. to <i>Interrogation</i> 1 excised [364]
	conversationi	1:26	[76.25/47.24]	( <i>conversatione</i> MS C) geleafan 7 gehwyrfednesse [62.17]
		3:27	[312.12/192.13]	drohtunge [242.3]
	conversationis	2:1	[124.20/74.32]	NT: Excised passage [94]
		3:8	[238.1/142.18]	( <i>monanchicae conuersationis</i> ) munuclifes [172.16]
		4:4	[346.18/213.7]	drohtunge [272.22]
		5:19	[520.7/324.14]	lif [454.14]
corrigo	correcta	5:21	[552.21/346.12]	geriht [470.25]
	correcti	3:4		NT: Excised chapter
		3:30		NT: Subtitle cut
		4:25	[422.1/262.29]	witnade 7 bette [350.2]
		5:22	[554.32/348.7]	geriht [474.17]
	correctos	5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	correxix	5:24	[570.1/359.9]	NT: 'List of works'—incomplete
	correxix	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
		5:19	[528.34/330.19]	NT: Excised document (epitaph) [464]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
		5:24	[566.9/356.12]	NT: Excised annals
	corriganur	1:27	[82.13-14/50.6]	gerehte [68.5]
		1:27	[86.36/53.4]	gerehte 7 gebette beon scylen [74.1]
		1:27	[88.17/53.24]	gerehte [74.10]
	corrigibat	3:5	[226.31/136.24]	heo gebette [162.14]
		4:2	[334.18/205.22]	rehte 7 bette (context recalls <i>Int.</i> 7) [260.2]
	corrigeno	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
		2:5	[150.30/90.34]	( <i>castigando et corrigendo</i> ) geclænsed 7 gereht [110.31-2]
		2:19		NT: Excised chapter
	corrigeno	3:30	[322.21/199.25]	to gerecenne [250.20]
		4:27	[432.16/269.23]	to gerecenne [362.18]



	corrigere	1:10		NT: Excised chapter
		3:13	[254.4/153.10]	(Rephrased) gesecgan [190.27]
		3:22	[284.18/173.29]	( <i>prohibere et corrigere</i> ) bewerian 7 gereccan [228.10]
		5:13	[502.14/313.19]	gereccan [442.2]
	corrigi	1:27	[82.10/50.2]	geriht [68.2]
	corrigit	1:27	[84.32/51.27]	receð [72.1]
	corrigitur	1:27	[82.15/50.8]	(Rephrased) þrea [68.8]
	defleo	defleant	1:27 [96.29/58.3]	wepen 7 hreowe [82.28]
		deflendo	2:1 [124.5/74.14]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	deliberatio	deliberatione	1:27 [100.27/61.14]	þoncmeotunge 7 þreodunge [88.4]
dicto	dictando	5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	dictante	3:2	[216.20/130.7]	NT: Excised passage [156]
	dictat	1:27	[82.21/50.15]	dihtað 7 findeð [68.16]
	dictavi	4:5	[352.21/217.12]	NT: Excised passage [281]
disciplina	disciplinae	1:27	[86.36/53.4]	þeodscipes 7 þrea [74.2]
		3:3	[229.18/132.24]	þeodscipe [158.30]
		3:23	[286.32/175.31]	þeodscipes [232.4]
		4:3	[340.19/209.9]	þeodscipes [266.6]
		4:9	[360.5/222.3]	þeodscipes [288.1]
		4:10	[362.28/224.9]	þeodscipes [292.5]
		4:27	[434.6/270.19]	ðeodscipes [364.18]
		5:24	[566.25/357.11]	þeodscipes [480.30-482.1]
	disciplinam	1:27	[82.16/50.9]	(Rephrased) þreagean [68.10]
		3:5	[228.21/137.16]	þeodscype [164.6]
		3:22	[284.3/173.10]	þeodscipe [226.27]
		3:25		NT: Excised chapter
		4:2	[332.28-9/204.28]	þeodscipe [258.14]
	disciplinis	3:19	[270.17/164.21]	þeodscipa [210.30]
		4:23	[406.19/253.10]	þeodscipum [332.16]
		4:24	[418.23/261.12]	þeodscipum [346.18]
		5:19	[520.18/324.27]	þeodscypum [454.25]
	disciplinis	3:19	[270.8/164.10]	þeodscipum [210.23]

		3:25		NT: Excised chapter
		4:1	[328.10/201.15]	þeodscipum [252.13]
		4:1	[328.21/202.9]	þeodscipum [254.3]
		4:2	[336.3/206.6]	þeodscipum [260.17]
		4:6	[354.25/218.29]	þeodscipum [282.12]
		4:23	[408.8/254.6]	þeodscipum [334.8]
		5:8	[474.21/295.22]	ðiodscipum [408.4]
		5:19	[522.4/325.21]	( <i>disciplinis ac moribus</i> ) þeodscipum 7 þeawum [456.24]
districtius	districtius	1:27	[82.13/50.6]	þearlicor [68.5]
		1:27	[82.14/50.7]	heardor 7 strongor [68.6]
		4:25	[426.22/266.1]	heardwendlice [356.15]
districtus	districto	4:25	[422.13/263.13]	þearlwisan [350.15–16]
	districtos	1:28		NT: Excised letter Gregory–Vergilius
doceo	doceam	3:12	[250.6/151.2]	( <i>doceam te</i> ) þæt ic þe lære [186.25]
	doceant	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið–Nechtan
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið–Nechtan
	doceantur	1:27	[88.16/53.23]	seon gelærede [74.9]
	doceat	1:28		NT: Excised chapter
	doceatur	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið–Nechtan
	docebant	1:26	[76.7/47.3]	heo lærdon [60.27]
		1:26	[76.8/47.4]	heo lærdon [60.28]
		4:32	[448.5/279.29]	lærdon [382.7]
	docebat	2:1	[132.13/79.17]	lærde [94.22]
		2:13	[182.6/111.11]	lærde [134.3]
		3:5	[226.7/135.25]	lærde [226.7]
		3:26		NT: Excised chapter
		4:18	[388.26/241.28]	NT: Excised passage <i>Non solum...curabant</i> [314.25]
		4:28	[438.19/273.18]	Rephrased: lærde [368.32]
		5:22	[552.31/346.27]	lærde [472.6]
	docebimus	3:7	[234.5/140.17]	ongitan magon [168.25]
	docenda	4:12	[368.32/228.21]	lærde [298.23]

	5:9	[478.1/297.14]	to læranne [410.19]
docendae	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
docendam	3:21	[278.25/170.15]	læran ( <i>docendam baptizandamque: fulwian</i> <i>7 læran</i> ) [222.7]
docendas	5:9	[478.10/297.24]	to læranne [410.29]
docendi	3:17	[266.4/161.20]	to healdanne 7 to læranne ( <i>faciendi simul</i> <i>et docendi</i> ) [206.10-11]
	3:27	[314.17/194.4]	mid lare [244.21]
	4:27	[432.24/269.32]	(var. <i>dicendi</i> ) læran ongon [362.29]
docendo	2:20	[206.3/126.24]	þurh his lare ( <i>docendo et baptizando: þurh</i> <i>his lare 7 fullwibte</i> ) [150.26-27]
	3:5	[228.13/137.6]	in his lare [162.27]
	3:23	[288.34/177.9]	þurh his lare [234.17]
	4:9	[360.6/222.4]	lærde ( <i>docendo uel castigando: lærde 7</i> <i>clænsade</i> ) [288.2]
	5:15		NT: Excised chapter
docendos	5:24	[562.24/353.10]	NT: Excised annals
docendum	4:18		NT: Subtitle cut
	5:13	[500.2/311.27]	to lærenne ( <i>uisitandum ac docendum: to</i> <i>niosianne 7 to lærenne</i> ) [438.15]
docente	1:27	[80.26/49.16]	lærde 7 cwæð [66.12]
	2:14	[186.16/114.8]	mid ... lare [138.24]
	5:22	[554.14/347.17]	þurh ... lare [472.26-27]
docere	4:5	[348.28/214.27]	læran [276.6]
	4:23	[412.2/256.20]	monian 7 læran [338.17]
	5:24	[556.27/357.13]	lærde ( <i>aut discere aut docere aut scribere:</i> <i>opþe leornode opþe lærde oððe</i> <i>write</i> ) [482.3]
docerent	4:2	[334.8/205.10]	lærdon 7 tydon [258.24]
doceret	4:18	[338.28/241.31]	NT: Excised passage
			<i>Non solum...curabant</i> [314.25]
	5:20	[530.31/331.33]	lærde [466.20]
doceri	4:24	[418.9/260.29]	læran [344.34]

docet	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	4:5	[352.13/217.2]	læreð [280.2]
	4:11	[364.25/225.16]	sagað [294.3]
	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
doctis	4:23	[406.35/253.29]	gelærdum [332.31]
doctus	3:13	[252.19/152.25]	gelæred [190.12]
	5:15		NT: Excised chapter
docuere	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
docuerit	4:27		NT: Subtitle cut
docuerunt	5:11	[486.10/302.30]	lærdon [420.28]
docuimus	2:1	[128.11/76.34]	NT: excised passage [94]
	2:4	[146.5/87.18]	NT: excised passage: <i>sed, ut</i> <i>supra ... putarent</i> [108.2]
	2:9	[162.8/97.16]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) we aer beforan sægdon [120.6]
	2:19	[198.24/122.14]	NT: Excised passage [146]
	2:20	[204.9/125.23]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) we aer beforan sægdon [148.31]
	3:2	[216.10/129.28]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) NT: Excised passage ( <i>est autem ... pugnaturus statueret</i> ) [156.12]
	3:9	[240.24/145.3]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) we aer beforan sægdon [176.25]
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	5:19	[522.10/325.28]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) rephrased: we aer beforan gemyngedon [456.27-8]
	5:19	[528.22/330.7]	( <i>supra docuimus</i> ) we aer beforan sægdon 7 gemyngedon [464.22]
docuissent	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
docuit	3:19	[274.14/167.5]	lærde [216.11]
	3:22	[284.4/173.12]	lærde [226.26]
	4:13	[374.8/231.26]	lærde [304.8]

erudio	erudiebant	4:23	[408.11/254.10]	lærde [334.10]
		4:24	[418.7/260.27]	monade 7 lærde [344.31]
		4:3	[342.18/210.16]	cýde 7 lærde [268.13]
	erudiendas	3:8	[238.3/142.19]	to læranne ( <i>erudiendas ac sponso caelesti copulandas: to læranne 7 to geþeodenne þæm beofonlican brydguman</i> ) [172.17]
		3:5	[228.7/136.32]	getyde 7 gelærde [162.20]
		3:5	[228.26/137.22]	lareowe [164.12]
	erudiendo	3:26		NT: Excised chapter
		1:27	[80.3/48.22]	tydde 7 lærde [64.12]
		4:23	[408.3/253.32]	tydon 7 lærdon [334.1-2]
	erudiendos	3:18	[266.32/162.21]	tydde 7 lærde [208.11]
		4:2	[334.7/205.9]	tyde [258.23]
		1:27	[80.9/48.28]	getýd 7 gelæred [64.19]
	erudire	4:27	[434.17/270.32]	NT: Ref. to <i>Interrogation</i> 1 excised [364]
		3:26		NT: Excised chapter
		5:18	[514.24/321.13]	gelæred [448.11]
	eruditus	5:20	[532.4/332.7]	( <i>nutritus atque eruditus</i> ) afæded 7 gelæred [466.29]
		4:24	[418.1/260.20]	( <i>exponebantque</i> ) þa rehton heo him 7 sægdon [344.25]
		1:27	[94.11/57.3]	( <i>subiecit exponens</i> ) areccende 7 cwæð [80.11]
expono	exponebant	3:19	[274.21/167.14]	cyþan 7 secgan [216.20-21]
		4:23	[414.3/258.1]	arehton [340.29]
		2:19		NT: Excised chapter
	exponens	1:20		NT: Excised chapter
		5:24	[568.23/358.23]	NT: Excised passage [482.28-9]
		4:17	[384.29/239.17]	we wæron smeagende [310.24]
	exponere	4:17	[386.29/240.26]	we þa ðe asetton [312.31]
		1:27	[92.1/55.17]	slæhð [78.4]
		1:28		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Vergilius
	feriendum	4:3	[344.6/211.10]	sleanne [270.4]

	feriendus	1:7	[30.33/20.5]	NT: Edited passage [38.6-7]
	ferientibus	2:2	[140.32/84.29]	NT: Edited passage [104.4-8]
	ferire	1:7	[34.2/21.16]	sloge [40.13]
	feriunt	1:27	[82.18/50.11]	þreageað 7 swingað [68.11]
furor	furor	1:25	[76.1/46.26]	NT: Latin quotation retained without trans. [60.18-21]
	furore	1:7	[30.25/193.1]	wylme 7 yrre [36.30]
		1:27	[82.15/50.8]	nales of welme ne of hatheortnesse [68.7]
		2:5	[152.20/91.25]	hatheortnesse [112.22]
		3:11	[248.20/150.2]	NT: Edited passage [184.34-35]
	furores	1:17		NT: Excised chapter
	furoris	2:7	[158.5/94.29]	NT: Edited passage [118.12-14]
gemo	gemebant	1:17		NT: Excised chapter
	gemebat	1:27	[96.5/58.4]	geomrade [82.12]
		1:27	[102.4/61.25]	goiende 7 geomriende [88.17]
	gemit	1:12	[40.20/25.25]	( <i>gemitque</i> ) yrmdon 7 hyndon [44.10-11]
gemitus	gemitu	4:29	[440.19/274.27]	( <i>cum gemitu</i> ) mid mycelre eomrunge [372.6]
		5:6	[466.21/290.8]	( <i>cum gemitu</i> ) mid geomrunge [400.18]
	gemitus	1:27	[90.15/54.28]	gooung 7 sár [76.15]
	gemitus	1:13	[46.7/28.26]	geong 7 geomerung [48.5]
ingemisco	ingemiscat	1:27	[102.3/61.24]	goað 7 geomrað [88.15]
insequor	insequibantur	3:11	[246.13/148.15]	ehton [182.22]
	insequere	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	insequi	1:27	[82.20/50.13]	eahtan 7 witnian [68.14-15]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	insequimur	1:27	[96.10/58.9]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [82.16]*
	insequitur	1:12	[44.21/28.5]	ehtan (7 slogan) [46.21]
		1:27	[96.16/58.16]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [82.16]*
lavo	lavandus	1:27	[98.24/59.32]	ápweanne [86.1]
	lavaret	5:4	[462.28/287.23]	þwoge [396.5]
	lavari	1:27	[94.24/57.17]	aðwegen 7 bebaðad beon [80.26]

		4:19	[392.22/244.9]	baðian [318.16]
	lavasset	4:31	[446.1/278.9]	wæscan 7 feormian [378.18-19]
	laverant	3:11	[246.25/148.31]	þwogon [184.3]
	laverunt	4:19	[396.13/246.20]	þwogon 7 baðodon [322.32]
	lavetur	1:27	[88.26/53.34]	he bibaðod sy [74.19]
	lavit	3:9	[244.3/146.22]	þwóh [180.9]
	lota	3:11	[246.21/148.26]	on þwógon [182.32]
	lotis	4:19	[392.22/244.10]	onþwegne [318.19]
	lotum	1:27	[98.20/59.27]	aþwegen [84.26]
	lotum	3:8	[240.18/144.22]	onþwogon [176.18]
	lotus	1:27	[94.22/57.14]	aþwegen 7 bibaðod sy [80.23]
		1:27	[94.23/57.15]	he bibaðod si [80.24]
		1:27	[98.11/59.18]	aþwegen 7 bibaðod bið [84.18]
lavacrum	lavacri	1:20		NT: Excised chapter
		1:27	[94.34/57.27]	bæðes 7 þweales [82.2]
		2:14	[188.4/114.30]	fulwihtbæðes [140.8]
		3:11	[248.4/149.15]	þweales [184.17]
		3:23	[288.28/177.2]	bæðes [234.10]
	lavacro	1:7	[34.4/21.19]	bæþes [40.14]
		1:20		NT: Excised chapter
		2:14	[180.11/115.6]	bæðe [140.14]
		3:7	[232.15/139.25]	(fulwihte) bæðe [168.5]
	lavacrum	1:27	[84.31/51.25]	bæðe [70.33]
		2:5	[152.14/91.8]	bæð [112.15]
		2:14	[186.8/113.28]	(fulwihte) bæðe [138.18]
		3:11	[246.27/148.33]	bæð [184.5]
		3:18	[266.30/162.18]	bæð [208.7]
		4:13	[372.6/230.12]	fulwihtebæþ [302.1-2]
		4:16	[382.14/237.16]	(fulwihte) bæð [308.4]
mens	mens	1:27	[82.21/50.15]	mód [68.16]
		1:27	[94.18/57.10]	mód [80.18]
		1:27	[94.19/57.11]	mod [80.19]
		1:27	[96.14/58.14]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int. 8</i> ) [82.16]*

	1:27	[100.9/60.23]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int. 9</i> ) [86.18]*
	1:27	[100.28/61.16]	(var.: <i>si mens</i> early corrected to <i>semen</i> (n. CM 100) <i>si mens est</i> /- <i>semen est</i> : þæt bið fædnis [88.6]
	2:11		NT: Excised chapter
mente	1:15	[52.27/33.3]	mode [54.6]
	1:27	[82.20/50.14]	moode [68.15]
	1:27	[88.1/53.7]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int. 7</i> ) [74.3]*
	1:27	[94.20/57.12]	móde [80.20]
	1:27	[94.29/57.22]	mode [80.31]
	1:27	[96.35/59.5]	moode [84.3]
	1:27	[100.24/61.11]	moode [86.34]
	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	2:5	[152.27/91.33]	mode [112.30]
	2:12	[180.8/109.31]	mode [130.22]
	3:22	[284.13/173.23]	( <i>placida mente</i> ) smylte móde 7 bliðe [228.4]
	4:3	[342.27/210.27]	( <i>fixa mente</i> ) fæste moode [268.22]
	4:8	[358.23/221.13]	( <i>insana mente</i> ) úngewitge móde [286.16]
	4:10	[364.14/225.1]	( <i>quod mente conceperat</i> ) þæt hire on mod becwom [292.24]
	4:19	[390.27/243.6]	ón móde ( <i>mente et opere: ge ón móde ge on</i> <i>dædum</i> ) [316.11-12]
	4:24	[420.21/262.13]	mode ( <i>simplici ac pura mente: bluttre mode</i> 7 bilwitre) [348.19]
	4:28	[438.2/272.31]	( <i>mente prophetica</i> ) witedomes gast [368.19-20]
	4:31	[446.9/278.19]	on his mode [378.29]
	4:31	[446.14/278.25]	( <i>placide mente</i> ) mid smolte mode [380.5]
	5:7	[470.6/292.21]	on his mode [404.25]



	5:7	[472.6/293.28]	NT: Excised document (epitaph) [406.8]
	5:11	[486.31/303.22]	NT: Edited passage [422.17]
	5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	5:19	[518.18/323.16]	on his mode [452.15]
	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
mentem	1:27	[100.6/60.19]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int. 9</i> ) [86.18]*
	1:31		NT: Excised chapter
	2:1	[124.31/75.11]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	2:1	[132.35/80.11]	NT: Excised clause [96.20]
	3:11	[248.22/150.5]	gemynde [186.3]
	3:13	[254.5/153.12]	mod ( <i>mentem uitamque: min mod 7 min lif</i> ) [190.28]
	4:3	[344.1/211.4]	heora mode [268.33]
	4:10	[364.11/224.28]	( <i>uenit in mentem</i> ) becwon on mod [292.20]
	4:24	[420.11/262.1]	( <i>placidissimam se mentem</i> ) swiðe bliðemode [348.8]
	4:24	[420.13/262.3]	Rephrased [348.9]
	4:24	[420.14/262.4]	( <i>placidam ego mentem</i> ) ic eom swiðe bliðemod [348.10]
mentes	1:27	[82.6/49.32]	mod [66.27]
	1:27	[88.6/53.12]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int. 7</i> ) [74.7]*
	2:9	[164.12/98.30]	þa mood [122.6]
menti	1:27	[98.28/60.3]	moode [86.5]
mentibus	2:10		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Edwin
mentibus	1:30		NT: Excised chapter
	2:19		NT: Excised chapter
mentis	Pref.	[6.24/8.11]	NT: Edited passage [6.1-3]
	1:7	[32.4/20.14]	modes [38.14]
	1:14	[48.17/30.9]	modes [50.3]
	1:27	[102.5/61.26]	( <i>meae mentis</i> ) mines moodes [88.18]
	1:27	[102.9/61.29]	þæs moodes [88.21]

		2:5	[150.31/91.1]	( <i>mentis uaesania</i> ) mid wedenheortnesse modes [110.32-3]
		2:7	[156.18/94.9]	his modes [116.30]
		2:7	[156.20/94.12]	(Rephrased) mid mode [116.33]
		2:8		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Justus
		2:10		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Edwin
		2:12	[178.7/108.20]	his modes [128.14]
		2:17		NT: Excised letter Honorius-Edwin
		3:5	[228.15/137.8]	modes ( <i>indomabiles et durae ac barbarae</i> <i>mentis: unatemedlice 7 beardes modes</i> 7 <i>elreordes</i> ) [162.29]
		3:9	[242.5/145.13]	modes [178.1]
		4:20		NT: Excised chapter
		4:23	[412.26/257.18]	( <i>uisione mentis</i> ) modes gesyhðe [340.14]
		4:27	[430.24/268.27]	modes ( <i>corporis et mentis: lichaman ond</i> <i>modes</i> ) [360.23]
		5:12	[488.24/304.24]	modes ( <i>mentis et corporis: modes 7</i> <i>lichoman</i> ) [424.14]
		5:14	[504.18/314.33]	NT: Edited passage [444.15-17]
		5:14	[504.20/314.34]	modes ( <i>mentis et actionis: modes 7 dæde</i> ) [444.18]
		5:19	[516.14/322.10]	( <i>deuotione mentis</i> ) willsumnesse modes [450.4]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	mentium	1:27	[92.27/56.11]	mooda 7 monna [78.34]
nosco	norunt	4:2	[334.3/205.3]	(Rephrased) (wel) gelærde; cuðon [258.16,17]
		5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	noscendis	Pref.	[2.8/5.9]	NT: Edited passage [4]
	noscendum	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	noscendum	3:23	[286.15/175.11]	( <i>diligendum noscendumque</i> ) lufade 7 cúðæ [230.16]
	noscitur	2:10		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Edwin

	2:11		NT: Excised chapter
	4:27	[434.15/270.29]	NT: Ref. to <i>Interrogation</i> 1 excised [364]
noscuntur	2:17		NT: Excised letter Honorius-Edwin
	2:19		NT: Excised chapter
	3:2	[214.27/129.14]	NT: Edited passage [156]
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	4:13	[374.28/232.17]	NT: Edited passage [304.27–28]
	5:9	[476.6/296.15]	NT: Edited passage [408]
nosse	Pref.	[6.10/7.28]	ongeat [4.27]
	1:27	[80.2/48.20]	const [64.12]
	2:1	[128.3/76.23]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	3:16	[262.2/158.29]	cuðon [200.27]
	4:22	[402.24/250.30]	(ne) cuðe [328.9]
nossum	5:6	[468.4/291.1]	( <i>nossem</i> ) wiste [402.13]
	5:6	[498.12/291.11]	( <i>nossem</i> ) wiste [402.21]
	5:14	[502.21/313.28]	( <i>nossem</i> ) cuðe [442.9]
nossent	1:23	[68.25/42.27]	(ne) cuþon [56.5]
	4:5	[348.25/214.24]	( <i>diligerent et nossent</i> ) lufedon 7 cuðon [276.5]
nosset	4:25	[424.18/264.26]	cúðe 7 ongete [352.31]
nosti	4:2	[334.20/205.25]	wast [260.5]
	4:29	[440.22/275.1]	wast [372.11]
nostis	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
nota	4:4	[346.27/213.18]	cúðe [274.2]
notas	5:23	[556.11/348.27]	cuð [476.1]
notum	4:23	[412.18/257.9]	cuðne [340.5]
notus	4:1	[330.3/202.24]	cuð [254.16]
	5:2	[456.30/283.21]	cuð [388.16]
	5:19	[518.19/323.18]	cuð [452.16]
noveram	5:6	[468.14/291.14]	wiste [402.25]
noverant	3:11	[246.11/148.13]	wisten [182.21]
	3:14	[258.33/157.7]	(ne) cuðe [198.6]
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter

	4:2	[334.10/205.12]	cúðon [258.25]
	4:23	[408.1/253.30]	cuðan [332.33]
	4:23	[410.16/255.25]	cuðon [336.22]
	5:20	[530.31/331.32]	cuðan [466.21]
noverat	Pref.	[4.28/7.11]	NT: Edited passage [4]
	2:1	[130.15/75.10]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	2:9	[166.15/100.11]	wiste [124.19]
	3:3	[220.7/132.10]	(ne) cuðe [158.10]
	3:7	[234.15/140.28]	(án) cuðe [170.1]
	4:18	[388.14/241.15]	wisse [314.14]
	5:9	[476.5/296.13]	wiste [408.21]
	5:22	[554.5/347.5]	cuðe [472.16]
novere	3:17	[266.9/161.26]	cuþon [206.16]
	4:1	[328.28/202.17]	NT: Edited passage [254.9-11]
	4:7	[356.8/219.13]	cuðon [282.22]
	4:19	[394.15/245.12]	cuðon [320.18]
	4:25	[420.32/262.28]	cuðon [348.30]
noverit	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	4:5	[352.26/217.17]	NT: Edited passage [280]
	4:9	[360.25/222.28]	NT: Edited passage [288.22-25]
	5:20	[530.14/331.12]	swa cuð 7 swa gemimor [466.2]
noverunt	5:2	[456.14/283.2]	cuðon [386.30]
novi	3:13	[254.6/153.12]	wat [190.29]
	3:25		NT: Excised chapter
	4:25	[424.23/264.33]	wat [354.8]
	5:6	[468.16/291.16]	cuðe [402.28]
	5:14	[502.21/313.28]	cuðe [442.9]
	5:21	[552.7/345.29]	wiste 7 ongeat [470.10-11]
novimus	1:1	[18.13/12.5]	witan [28.13]
	1:27	[80.17/49.6]	NT: Edited passage [66.1-3]
	1:27	[92.5/55.22]	we weotan 7 leorniað (in Cristes bocum) [78.10]

		2:5	[152.16/91.21]	we weotan [112.17]
	novit	1:27	[80.31/49.22]	const [66.18]
		3:24	[290.9/177.26]	onfón con (sense: <i>accept</i> ) [234.31]
penso	pensandum	1:27	[96.35/59.5]	to smeageanne 7 to geþencenne [84.3]
		1:27	[100.15/61.1]	asmeagenne [86.23]
	pensare	1:27	[82.10/50.2]	geþencan [68.1]
		2:1	[126.30/76.19]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	pensaret	2:1	[128.19/77.10]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	pensari	1:27	[98.27/60.2]	geþencan [86.4]
perduco	perducebant	2:1	[130.28-29/78.27]	NT: Excised passage [94]
	perducendum	4:18	[388.17-18/241.18]	gelædde [314.18]
	perducendus	4:14		NT: Excised chapter
	perducere	2:17		NT: Excised letter Honorius-Edwin
		5:15		NT: Excised chapter
	perduceret	4:1	[330.8/202.30]	his latteow beon [254.23]
		5:19	[518.33/323.34]	gelædde [454.1]
	perducit	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	perducta	1:27	[80.11/48.30]	becumen 7 gelæded [64.19]
		1:29		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Augustine
		4:8	[358.19/221.8]	gelæded [286.11]
		4:10	[364.20/225.1]	( <i>adducta</i> ) gelæded [292.24]
		4:27	[434.18-19/270.33]	NT: Ref. to <i>Interrogation</i> 1 excised [364]
	perducti	5:22	[552.25-26/346.19]	gelædde [470.29]
	perductum	3:8	[240.10/144.12]	geworht [176.6]
	perducturi	4:14		NT: Excised chapter
	perductus	1:7	[28.28-29/18.29]	læddon [34.28]
		4:24	[416.26/260.15]	gelædde [344.19]
		5:12	[488.8/304.4]	gelæded [422.28]
		5:14	[504.2/314.13]	gelæded [442.25]
	perduxerit	1:30		NT: Excised chapter
		2:8		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Justus
	perduxit	2:3	[144.12-13/86.20]	gelæde [106.15]
		2:15	[190.28/116.35]	gelædde [142.28]

placeo	placens	4:1	[332.3/203.28]	gelædde [256.22]
		5:11	[486.1/302.19]	gecerde [420.18]
		5:18	[514.17/321.5]	geteah 7 gelædde [448.3]
		5:21	[532.14/332.21]	gelædde [468.7]
		5:13	[498.18/311.8]	liciende [436.25]
		1:27	[82.1/49.26]	licie [66.22]
		2:1	[134.14/80.29]	licade [98.5]
		3:23	[288.22/176.29]	licade [234.1]
		1:27	[80.33/49.24]	þynceð 7 bet licað [66.19]
		4:5	[350.16/215.25]	licodon [276.33]
		3:17	[266.13/161.31]	liciað [206.19]
		4:30	[442.25/276.16]	ðæt licede 7 leof wære [374.26]
		4:10	[323.30/224.12]	licade [292.6]
		1:14	[48.26/30.19]	( <i>placuitque</i> ) gelicode [50.12]
		3:1	[214.5/128.14]	licade [154.10]
		3:8	[238.27/143.33]	( <i>placuitque</i> ) þuhte [174.25]
		4:5	[348.32/214.31]	licade [276.13]
		4:5	[352.4/216.23]	licade [278.25]
		4:5	[352.19/217.9]	NT: Excised passage [280.6]
		4:19	[394.1/244.29]	licode [320.1]
		4:23	[410.32/256.13]	licede [338.9]
		4:28	[438.12/273.9]	NT: Edited passage [368.26]
		5:17		NT: Excised chapter
		5:19	[524.2/326.30]	licade [460.8]
		5:24		NT: Excised chapter
poena	poena	2:1	[124.3/74.11]	NT: Excised passage [94]
		3:19	[274.12/167.2]	wiite [216.9]
	poena	4:25	[426.12/265.34]	wiíte [356.5]
		4:26	[428.13/267.8]	wite [358.11]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	poenae	4:24	[418.18/261.6]	wiites [346.13]
	poenam	1:7	[30.8/19.9]	wite [36.7]
		1:27	[90.17/54.30]	sar 7 wiite [76.18–19]

		3:19	[272.22/166.5]	wíte [214.12]
		4:13	[374.8/231.26]	wite [304.7]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	poenarum	5:14		NT: Subtitle cut
	poenas	1:7	[30.24/19.30]	wites [36.29]
		4:26	[428.3/266.25]	wítes [356.28]
		5:23	[556.26/349.16]	wite [476.19]
	poenis	5:13	[500.33/313.3]	witum [440.19]
	poenis	3:19	[274.7/166.31]	wiíta [216.4]
		4:22	[402.27/251.1]	bendum 7 witum [328.13]
polluo	polluendum	3:1	[212.16/127.22]	( <i>polluendum perdendumque</i> ) 7 hi sylfe þurh þæt forluran [152.20]
	pollui	2:9	[162.32/98.14]	besmiten [120.29]
	polluit	2:13	[186.5/113.24]	( <i>pollui ac destruxit</i> ) towearp 7 fordyde [138.15]
	polluta	1:27	[92.33/56.19]	NT: Excised passage ( <i>Int.</i> 8) [80.3]*
	pollutae	1:27	[94.14/57.6]	bismetenes (geþohtes) 7 unclænes [80.14]
	pollutum	1:27	[98.19/59.26]	bismiten [84.24]
	pollutum	1:27	[94.14/57.5]	unclæne 7 besmiten [80.13]
	pollutus	2:5	[150.25/90.28]	besmiten [110.26]
preacipuus	praecipua	1:27	[82.2/49.27]	( <i>institutione praecipua</i> ) fæstlice to healdenne [66.23]
	praecipuae	5:22	[554.2/347.2]	mæstan [472.12]
	praecipui	1:29	[104.4/63.6]	( <i>primi et praecipui</i> ) þa ærestan 7 þa mæstan [88.31]
	praecipuum	2:8		NT: Excised letter Boniface-Justus
	praecipuus	1:23	[68.16/42.16]	se hehsta [54.25]
		1:27	[102.4/61.25]	(bi þon) se mæsta (cempa) 7 se hehsta [88.16]
privo	privandi	1:27	[84.30/51.24]	biscergenne [70.31]
		1:27	[86.3/51.33]	bescyrienne [72.6]
	privari	1:27	[86.33/52.33]	bescerian ne beneoman [72.23-24]
	privati	5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan

prohibeo	privatum	2:9	[164.17/99.2]	beneoman [122.10]
	privatus	2:2	[136.14/82.5]	( <i>oculorum luce privatus</i> ) blinde [100.3]
		3:7	[234.2/140.12]	benom [168.20]
	privetur	1:27	[92.5/55.22]	bescyred [78.10]
	prohibeat	1:27	[94.9/56.32]	bewereð [80.7]
	prohibemus	1:25	[74.23/46.16]	beweriað [60.9]
		1:27	[90.16/54.29]	beweriað [76.17]
	prohibente	1:15	[52.16/32.22]	Rephrased: wiðstod [52.25]
		5:6	[466.19/290.6]	bewerede [400.15]
		5:19	[520.28/325.4]	bewerede [456.8]
	prohibentibus	4:26	[428.5/266.28]	beweredon [358.1]
	prohibentur	1:27	[90.35/55.16]	bewered [78.3]
	prohibere	1:27	[90.5/54.17]	bewered [76.2]
		1:27	[100.4/60.17]	NT: Edited passage [86.16-18]
		3:22	[284.18/173.29]	( <i>prohibere et corrigere</i> ) bewerian 7 gereccan [228.10]
	prohiberi	1:27	[92.2/55.19]	bewered [78.7]
		1:27	[92.25/56.9]	bewered [78.31]
		1:27	[96.25/58.27]	biwerigan [82.23-24]
	prohibet	1:27	[84.8/50.33]	bewereð 7 forbeodeð [70.8]
	prohibetur	1:27	[90.19/54.34]	bewered [76.22]
	prohibito	4:5	[354.1/217.31]	bewered [280.17]
	prohibitum	1:27	[84.17/51.9]	bewered [70.19]
	prohibuerunt	4:26	[428.10-11/267.4]	beweredon [358.1]
	prohibuisset	4:19	[392.26/244.25]	bewere [318.23]
	prohibuit	3:21	[280.6/170.27]	bewerede [222.18]
		4:11	[368.1/227.9]	bewerede [296.25]
subiicio	subiecit	1:27	[94.11/57.3]	( <i>subiecit exponens</i> ) areccende 7 cwæð [80.11]
		2:5	[150.1/89.26]	underþeodde [110.2]
		3:24	[294.3/180.9]	underþeodde [238.31]
		5:21		NT: Excised letter Ceolfrið-Nechtan
	subiecta	4:12	[370.26/229.26]	underþeoded [300.22]



	subiecta	1:31		NT: Excised chapter
	subiectae	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	subiectae	5:23	[558.29/350.26]	underþeodde [478.23]
	subiecti	3:4		NT: Excised chapter
		3:30	[322.10/199.12]	underþeodde [250.3]
	subiectis	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
		2:5	[152.5/91.7]	( <i>subiectisque</i> ) underþeodde [112.7]
	subiectis	1:32		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Æðelberht
	subiectis	5:22		NT: Subtitle cut
	subiectos	1:29		NT: Excised letter Gregory-Augustine
subiungo	subiungere	1:27	[96.32/59.1]	underðeodde 7 æftercwæð [82.32]
	subiungit	1:27	[94.18/57.10]	7 æfter cwæð [80.18]
	subiunxit	2:1	[124.9/74.18]	NT: Excised passage [94]
		4:3	[340.22/209.12]	he únderþeodde 7 him sægde [266.9-10]
		4:9	[362.13/223.23]	æfter þon heo cwæð [290.19]
		1:27	[82.13/50.5]	NT: Edited passage [66.5]
		1:27	[82.18/50.11]	NT: Edited passage [68.11]
		2:6	[154.20-21/93.3]	swingum [114.29]

*APPENDIX C—Passages of more than five words deleted from the Libellus  
for the OE version*

The figure in square brackets denotes the *Interrogation* in which the passage is found.

<i>Point of excision (Miller)</i>	<i>Excised text</i>	<i>Location (CM)</i>
66.23 [2]	quae de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas	82.2-3
70.15 [5]	Neque enim patris turpitudinem filius reuelare potest	84.13
70.22-3 [5]	cui non est dictum ut Christum negaret, et pro Christi confessione occisus est; sed quia isdem Dominus noster Iesus Christus dixerat: 'Ego sum ueritas,' quia pro ueritate Iohannes occisus est, uidelicet et pro Christo sanguinem fudit.	84.19-23
72.16 [6]	Sed fraternitatem tuam ita uolumus episcopos ordinare, ut ipsi sibi episcopi longo interuallo minime disiungantur, quatinus nulla sit necessitas ut in ordinatione episcopi pastores quoque alii, quorum praesentia ualde est utilis, facile debeant conuenire. Cum igitur auctore Deo ita fuerint episcopi in propinquis sibi locis ordinati,	86.12-17
72.18 [6]	Nam in ipsis rebus spiritalibus, ut sapienter et mature disponantur, exemplum trahere a rebus etiam carnalibus possumus. Certe enim dum conuigia in mundo celebrantur, coniugati quique conuocantur, ut qui in uia iam coniugii praecesserunt, in subsequentis quoque copulae gaudio misceantur. Cur non ergo et in hac spiritali ordinatione, qua per sacrum ministerium homo Deo coniungitur, tales conueniant, qui uel in prouectu ordinati episcopi gaudeant,	86.19.26
74.3 [7]	Cui etiam epistulas fecimus, ut cum tuae sanctitatis praesentia in Gallis et ipse tota mente subueniat,	86.37-88.2

74.7 [7]	<p>prauorum mentes ad sanctitatis studia reforma, quia scriptum est in lege: 'Per alienam messem transiens falcem mittere non debet, sed manu spicas conterere et manducare.' Falcem enim iudicii mittere non potes in ea segete, quae alteri uidetur esse commissa, sed per affectum boni operis frumenta dominica uitiorum suorum paleis expolia, et in ecclesiae corpore monendo et persuadendo quasi mandendo conuerte. Quicquid uero ex auctoritate agendum est, cum praedicto Arelatense episcopo agatur, ne praetermitti possit hoc, quod antiqua patrum institutio inuenit.</p>	88.6-14
74.23 [8]	<p>Hoc non ambigo fraternitatem tuam esse requisitam, cui iam et responsum reddidisse me arbitror; sed hoc, quod ipse dicere et sentire potuisti, credo quia mea apud te uolueris responsione firmari.</p>	88.29-32
76.26 [8]	<p>dum adhuc tempus ad praebendum redemptionis mysterium quaeritur, interueniente</p>	90.23-4
80.2 [8]	<p>Menstrua enim consuetudo mulieribus non aliqua culpa est, uidelicet quae naturaliter accedit; sed tamen quod natura ipsa ita uitata est, ut etiam sine uoluntatis studio uideatur esse polluta, ex culpa uenit uitium, in quo se ipsa, qualis per iudicium facta sit, humana natura cognoscat, et homo, qui culpam sponte perpetravit, reatum culpa portet inuitus. Atque ideo feminae cum semet ipsis considerent, et si in menstrua consuetudine ad sacramentum dominici corporis et sanguinis accedere non praesumant, de sua recta consideratione laudandae sunt; dum vero percipiendo ex religiosae uitae consuetudine eiusdem mysterii amore rapiuntur, reprimendae, sicut praediximus, non sunt.</p>	92.30-94.5
82.16 [8]	<p>Sunt etenim multa quae licita ac legitima, et tamen in eorum actu aliquatenus fedamur, sicut saepe irascendo culpas insequimur et tranquillitatem in nobis animi perturbamus; et cum rectum sit quod agitur, non est tamen adprobabile quod in eo animus perturbatur. Contra</p>	96.8-19

uitia quippe delinquentium iratus fuerat, qui dicebat:  
 ‘Turbatus est prae ira oculus meus.’ Quia enim non ualet  
 nisi tranquilla mens in contemplationis se lucem  
 suspendere, in ira suum oculum turbatum dolebat, quia,  
 dum male acta deorsum insequitur, confundi atque  
 turbari a summorum contemplatione cogeatur. Et  
 laudabilis ergo est ira contra uitium, et tamen molesta,  
 qua turbatum se aliquem reatum incurrisse aestimabat.

86.12 [9]	gulae in sumendis alimentis rapitur, atque idcirco umorum receptacula grauantur,	98.33-4
86.17 [9]	inlusio pro crapula facta a perceptione sacri mysterii prohibere non debet, sed	100.3-4
86.18 [9]	si tamen dormientis mentem turpi imaginatione non concusserit. Nam sunt quibus ita plerumque inlusio nascitur, ut eorum animus, etiam in somno corporis positus, turpis imaginationibus non fedetur. Qua in re unum ibi ostenditur ipsa mens rea, non tamen uel suo iudicio libera, cum se etsi dormienti corpore nihil meminit uidisse, tamen in uigiliis corporis meminit in ingluuiem cecidisse.	100.6-11






## APPENDIX D—Comparative maps of the Latin and Old English HE texts

Chapter	Preface	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5
	89					
1		107	217*	35	75	41
2		37	102	60	50	53
3		25	40	49	173	46
4		9	59*	63	31	27
5		19	85	62	100*	26
6		22	36	32	30	79
7		108	40	74	32	57*
8		21	48*	70	26	39
9		17	86	52	59	69
10		18*	90*	25	31	70
11		24	70*	74	55	56
12		77	115	34	56	193
13		23	66	48	72	71
14		34	47	88	81	40
15		60	35	29	13	49
16		14	37	22	44	42*
17		64	39*	73	52*	39*
18		27	52*	29	57	43
19		26	50*	143	110	250*
20		45	64	14	60	41
21		45		47	13	390*
22		12		79	73	45
23		38*		71	167	87
24		21*		93	103	185
25		53		127	101	
26		30		65	58	
27		410*		68	76	
28		22*		36	76	
29		46*		81*	56	
30		39*		24	46	
31		30*			36	
32		68*			35	
33		21				
34		21				
Ave. lines per Chapter		48	69	62	64	85
Total Lines		1638	1378	1874	2041	2038
% Overall Total		18	15	21	23	23
Model Content (Cbps)		7 (20%)	8 (40%)	17 (57%)	15 (47%)	7 (29%)
Excised Chapters		12 (35%)	2 (10%)	3 (10%)	2 (1%)	3 (13%)

### Latin HE

Chapter length figures are taken from Higham's table 'The Structure of the *Ecclesiastical History*' (Higham 111)

### Key





	Contains moral/behavioural exemplars
	Excised from OE version
	Merged in OE version
	Split in OE version
	Contains quoted document

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Preface</i>	<i>Book 1</i>	<i>Book 2</i>	<i>Book 3</i>	<i>Book 4</i>	<i>Book 5</i>
	58					
<b>1</b>		[1] 79	[1] 72*	<del>[1/2] 87</del>	[1] 92	[1] 48
<b>2</b>		[2] 3	[2] 96	[3] 34	[2] 48	[2] 60
<b>3</b>		[3] 15	[3] 36	[5] 71	[3] 201	[3] 54
<b>4</b>		[4] 10	[4] 34	[6] 34	[4] 35	[4] 31
<b>5</b>		[5] 10	[5] 86	[7] 79	[5] 80*	[5] 32
<b>6</b>		[6] 14	[6] 42	[8] 82	[5] 14	[6] 96
<b>7</b>		[7] 127	<del>[7/8] 41</del>	[9] 55	[6] 29	[7] 33
<b>8</b>		[8] 20	[9] 95	[10] 27	[7] 40	[8] 27
<b>9</b>		<del>[11/12] 64</del>	<del>[10/12] 138</del>	[11] 79	[8] 12	[9] 74
<b>10</b>		[13] 17	[13] 73	[12] 40	[8] 18	[10] 17
<b>11</b>		[14] 35	[14] 41	[13] 56	[9] 44	[10] 67
<b>12</b>		<del>[15/16] 66</del>	[15] 36	[14] 96	[9] 26	[11] 57
<b>13</b>		[23] 36	[16] 22	[15] 39	[10] 35	[12] 227
<b>14</b>		[25] 55	<del>[16/17] 22</del>	<del>[16-20] 316</del>	[11] 63	[13] 83
<b>15</b>		[26] 36	[18] 18	[21] 52	[12] 12	[14] 47
<b>16</b>		<del>[27/29/32] 27</del>	[20] 71	[22] 90	[12] 42	[18] 46
<b>17</b>		[33] 22		[23] 80	<del>[13/15] 90</del>	[19] 245
<b>18</b>		[34] 23		[24] 101	[16] 50	[20] 45
<b>19</b>				[27] 75	[17] 60*	[21] 54
<b>20</b>				[28] 41	[18] 40	[22] 59
<b>21</b>				[29] 27	[19] 146	[23] 42
<b>22</b>				[30] 32	[21] 16	[24] 141
<b>23</b>				[1:27] 367*	[22] 90	
<b>24</b>					[23] 177	
<b>25</b>					[24] 123	
<b>26</b>					[25] 119	
<b>27</b>					[26] 64	
<b>28</b>					[27] 73	
<b>29</b>					[28] 83	
<b>30</b>					[29] 67	
<b>31</b>					[30] 57	
<b>32</b>					[31] 48	
<b>33</b>					[32] 41	
<b>34</b>						
<i>Ave. lines per Chapter</i>		37	58	85	65	72
<i>Total Lines</i>		659	923	1960	2135	1585
<i>% Overall Total</i>		<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>
<i>Model Content (Cbps)</i>		6 (33%)	8 (50%)	14 (61%)	16 (48%)	7 (31%)

### Old English *HE*

Figures in square brackets indicate the corresponding chapter/s in the Latin version.

### Key

	Contains moral/behavioural exemplars
	Merged in Latin version
	Split in Latin version
	Contains quoted document